

Educational Perspectives

Journal of the College of Education/University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

CONTENTS

Dean Randy Hitz

Editor Hunter McEwan
Managing Editor Marcia H Little

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION EDITORIAL BOARD

Linda Johnsrud, *Associate Dean*
Kathryn Au, *Professor*
Curtis Ho, *Associate Professor*
Mary Jo Noonan, *Professor*
Robert Potter, *Professor Emeritus*
Lynn Tabata, *Graduate Student Organization President*

The Journal and the College of Education assume no responsibility for the opinion or facts in signed articles, except to the extent of expressing the view, by the fact of publication, that the subject matter is one which merits attention.

Published twice each year by the College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Subscription Rate: \$5 per year; individual copies \$3.

Address all communications regarding single copies, subscriptions, manuscripts and correspondence about editorial material to Editor, *Educational Perspectives*, College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Wist Annex 2 Room 131, 1776 University Avenue, Honolulu HI 96822.

Copyright 2000 by the College of Education, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

This publication is available in microform from Bell & Howell, 300 N Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) 0013-1849.

2 Editorial

—Hunter McEwan

4 Renewing the Partnership

—Randy Hitz, Judith R Hughes, Arthur R King, Jr, and Paul G LeMahieu

9 Evolution of a Collaborative Partnership

—Joseph Zilliox

14 A School/University Partnership from a School Perspective

—Nanna S Brantigan, Ann E Foley and Karen S McElliott

19 Journey of a Blue Ribbon Partnership

—William Greene with Kathy Nagaji, Wendy Larrow, Wendy Lum, Nancy Morikawa, Gloria Shoda, Ray Sugai and Joseph Zilliox

25 Partnerships for Simultaneous Renewal: A Progress Report

—Richard W Clark

Cover Photo: Derek Minakami of Kailua High School is honored by Governor Benjamin Cayetano as the first Hawai'i public school teacher to receive national teacher certification. He is accompanied by his wife, Lisa Maruyama (right) and Kailua High School principal, Mary Murakami.

Rethinking Educational Partnerships
Volume 33 ■ Number 1, Spring 2000

Editorial

Hunter McEwan

In the previous issue of *Educational Perspectives*, Alex Pickens bid farewell to 35 years as executive editor. Over the years, Alex has edited 102 issues of the journal, working with a number of guest editors, to bring university research and ideas on a wide variety of educational topics to public attention. *Educational Perspectives* has served the College well, both as an outlet of informed opinion on educational matters of importance to the people of Hawai'i and as a means of widely disseminating research and other achievements of College of Education faculty.

Educational Perspectives is a window on the work that we do here in Hawai'i—a window that is all the more valuable to us, given our distance from other colleges of education and fellow researchers on the mainland. But just as it throws light on what we are currently engaged in, *Educational Perspectives* also opens a window on the past achievements of College faculty and graduates.

Over 500 articles, in a total of 108 issues over 38 years, provide a record of numerous faculty research studies, educational challenges, and reform projects. Past issues have covered a diverse set of important topics, such as creativity and creative dramatics in education (Volume 4, #2, May, 1965); sports in early Hawaiian culture (Volume 4, #4, December, 1965); student unrest and the student movement at UH (Volume 8, #2, May, 1969); science teaching in the elementary school (Volume 10, #1, March, 1971); Hawai'i's community colleges (Volume 13, #2, May, 1974) and many more intriguing themes. Most issues have drawn on the expertise of our faculty, but not exclusively. The journal has attracted many contributors from further afield, who have helped to widen the context and provide an alternative perspective on matters of local importance. It is a credit to Alex Pickens' leadership of the journal that the College retains such a valuable resource.

After a search for a new editor conducted by the Graduate Chairs' Council, I was appointed by Dean Randy Hitz as the third editor of *Educational Perspectives* in June, 1999. I am happy to announce two developments since then.

The first is that we have formed a new Editorial Board. The Board members are: Linda Johnsrud, Associate Dean of the College, who will be representing the Graduate Chair's Council; Kathy Au, professor from Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies; Mary Jo Noonan, professor from Special Education; Curtis Ho, associate professor from Educational Technology; Lynn N Tabata, current president of COEDSA, representing our graduate students and Robert Potter,

emeritus professor. In addition to developing a policy for the journal, the Board will assist me in determining themes for future issues. They will also offer advice on the format of future issues of the journal. I am fortunate to have the assistance of this knowledgeable group in plotting a new course for the journal over the next few years. I am also fortunate in having Marcia Little continue as Managing Editor. Marcia has been with the journal since October, 1994. Her understanding of the details of journal production and her technical skills, which include knowledge of desktop publishing and graphic art, are as much appreciated by this editor as they were by my predecessor.

The second development is that we have created an official web site located at <www.hawaii.edu/edper/>. The pages are still under construction, but I hope that our readers will take time to visit and, if they feel inclined, to comment on the present issue, by emailing me at <epedit@hawaii.edu>. I will be adding some links and supplementary graphics that are illustrative of future themes, such as educational partnerships—the theme of our current issue.

Finally, I'd like to introduce some of the initiatives that are currently being considered by the Board. The first is to elaborate a new set of policies for the Journal that will help guide its development over the next few years. Our goal is to make the journal serve the teachers of this state by connecting developments in research and policy with classroom practice.

From its onset, the journal has been conceived as theme-based, and there are no plans to change this approach. We will, however, provide advanced notice of forthcoming themes, to alert potential contributors. Currently, we are working on an issue, due out in Fall, 2000, that will include a retrospective look at some of the College's institutions and personalities. In the Spring, 2001 issue, we will explore a subject that is of considerable topical interest, Standards and Assessment. In Fall, 2001, the journal will present a series of articles on another topic that is of vital interest to Hawai'i, health education. Keep your eyes on the journal's web site for updates on future themes.

The current issue, to use the metaphor introduced earlier, opens a window on recent developments in the partnership between the University of Hawai'i and the Department of Education. The partnership theme was first introduced in *Educational Perspectives* in 1989 when the Hawai'i Partnership was just getting under way. A great deal has occurred in the

intervening decade. The original Hawai'i School University Partnership (now reborn as the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships) has played a vital role in reforming teacher education in the College as well as helping to create a much greater presence of university faculty in the public schools. The current issue assesses some of these developments and looks at the future challenges to be faced in producing a renewed, expanded, and more robust partnership

The first article, by the members of the Executive Board of the new partnership, Dean Randy Hitz, Superintendent LeMahieu, Dean Judith Hughes, and Art King, Director of the CRDG, outlines some of the new initiatives being tackled by the Partnership and provides details of an expanded set of goals that build on earlier achievements. The authors cite the need to sustain partnership efforts that improve teacher education at all levels, continue the work of developing partner schools, increase participation of faculty from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences in Hawai'i's public schools, and redouble efforts to obtain the level of funding necessary to support these goals. The expansion of the partnership to include the Curriculum Research and Development Group and the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and the creation of new initiatives, such as the Policy Studies Center, aim to realize the full potential of partnership efforts for the schools and children of Hawai'i.

In the second article, Joe Zilliox provides a brief history of the Partnership from its inception in 1986 and offers a critical perspective on the challenges that face the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships as it moves into its fourteenth year of operation. Zilliox echoes the concerns raised by Hitz *et al* of developing partner schools as "effective institutions within the state." In addition, he points to the importance of the vital personal relationships, the small "p" partnerships in producing effective educational change, and their place within a more formal, partner organization, the Big "P" partnership.

This is a theme that is pursued in the two following pieces.

Anne Foley and her co-authors provide a very personal account of their experiences as partner teachers and administrators in a situation where the Big "P" partnership failed or at least faltered as resources were drawn away from partnership work and redirected to meet other priorities including, it should be noted, an "emphasis on curriculum standards and performance-based assessment." (p. 16). There are important implications here for educators at all levels to consider. Their account provides lucid testimony, from the perspective of school personnel, of the effectiveness of nurturing close working associations with university faculty. However, their article also warns of the costs when such efforts are brought abruptly to an end; when, as one of our contributors, Richard Clark, would have it, the partnership dies (pg 31). Foley,



Hunter McEwan

Brantigan, and McElliott raise the importance of trust in the process of developing successful partnerships: a concept echoed by several other contributors. How is trust nurtured between groups of people who come to a common set of tasks with somewhat different institutional allegiances and professional responsibilities?

The article from Greene and his coauthors goes some of the way to answering how this process has evolved at one school in the Hawai'i partnership, Pearl Ridge Elementary School. They point to the establishment of a common set of agreements, the realization of mutual benefits, and the need for good communications as critical elements in this process. Both of these practitioner articles have a great deal to offer to those who are interested in making partnerships work.

In the final article, Richard Clark helps us to "see ourselves as others see us." Clark's position as Senior Associate with the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington allows him to assess the Hawai'i partnership from the unique standpoint of the insider-outsider, someone who has been a close observer of our partnership as well as similar partnerships in other states.

Clark identifies five constructs that are useful in assessing the quality of partnerships and applies them to the Hawai'i situation. His contribution is an important reminder of the complex nature of collaborative endeavors and of the need for a high level of institutional support. Clark provides a valuable critical analysis of local efforts and a mixed assessment of our accomplishments. His article does, however, strike a tone of optimism in noting the renewed commitment to the partnership of a new leadership group, the authors of our first article, and the expansion of the partnership into new areas, that include a fresh set of initiatives for the partnership.

Renewing the Partnership

Randy Hitz, Judith R Hughes, Arthur R King, Jr and Paul G LeMahieu

In the early 1980s, America experienced one of its periodic surges of concern for its public schools. A number of organizations commissioned critiques and policy documents, publishing them in a series of reports intended to persuade the American people of the vital importance of, and need for educational reform. The National Commission on Excellence in Education produced the most notable and memorable of these reports, *A Nation at Risk: the Imperative for Educational Reform* (April, 1983).

Though many people now question the accuracy of *A Nation At Risk*, nearly everyone acknowledges the profound impact it has had on the Nation. The report got the attention of the media, policy makers, educators, and the general public. While the major focus was on inadequacies in the curriculum, many of its recommendations were calls for better teacher preparation. In this and ensuing reports, colleges of education were criticized, among other things, for 1) focusing too much on pedagogy and not enough on subject matter, 2) being disconnected from the realities of schools, 3) providing too few opportunities for teacher candidates to work in schools, 4) lacking rigor, 5) being disconnected from the arts and sciences, and 6) providing irrelevant master's degree programs and other professional development experiences for teachers.

Teacher educators responded to many of these concerns. Deans of colleges of education in major universities exerted their leadership through the newly formed Holmes Group. John Goodlad and his colleagues at the University of Washington in the National Network for Educational Renewal directed attention to the preparation of teachers for our nation's schools. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education redesigned its standards and its accreditation process. In one way or other, these efforts sought to address the criticisms listed above by focusing particularly on two efforts: ensuring rigor of content preparation and reconnecting teacher education to the reality and aspirations of P-12 schools (Goodlad, 1990).

The Hawai'i School University Partnership was created in 1986 in the context of this national reform endeavor. John Dolly, Dean of the College of Education; Charles Toguchi, Superintendent of the Hawai'i State Department of Education (DOE) and Michael Chun, President of Kamehameha Schools initiated a school university partnership to draw on each other's organizational strengths, and support one another in simultaneously improving teacher preparation and P-12 education. In 1986, this forward-thinking local effort was accepted as one of the 16 founding partnerships of

Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal.

Since then, the Partnership has played an important role in efforts to reform the College's teacher education programs by assisting in the process of school renewal and in the training of leaders who understand the ways that educational partnerships can be used to promote educational change. New challenges, however, now face our public schools and the College of Education. Schools and teachers are increasingly being required to meet new, more rigorous standards, and the College is in the process of seeking national accreditation for its programs.

In recognition of these developments, a new vision of the partnership is taking shape. In 1998, the partnership officially took on a new name – the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HIEP). This was done, initially, to address the Omnibus Education Act of 1994 which requested that the University of Hawai'i establish a "Center for Teacher Education." But more directly, represents an effort to find new ways to involve faculty from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. Another factor that has led us to rethink the role of the Partnership has been our commitment to seeking national accreditation for our College programs through the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Major Accomplishments

The partnership has had a profound impact on the College of Education and has played an important role in the creation of 41 DOE partner schools. These schools provide a base for the field experiences of the student teachers who are now enrolled in our College programs. The major accomplishments of the Partnership fall into three areas: improving teacher education, improving schools, and providing leadership training.

Improving Teacher Education

Teachers are prepared quite differently by the College of Education than they were before the partnership was formed. All prospective teachers now spend much more time in schools. The time spent is also qualitatively different. Students engage in structured field experiences during each semester of their professional studies. Students enter the teacher education program in cohorts to form learning communities with teachers in partner schools. Improvements in the duration and quality of field experiences for

students teachers, and a new level of interaction between school and university, is now a source of new ideas for cooperating teachers and their schools. New teacher education programs at the College actively seek this mutual benefit.

Improving the Schools

One of the original functions of the partnership was to involve university faculty more actively in school renewal. The efforts of the Partnership have led to some small but positive gains and offer a foundation for future improvements in the evolution of professional development schools in Hawai'i. More university faculty now spend more time in the schools working on the preparation of student teachers and on the professional development of school personnel. College methods courses, taught on-site, provide a forum where faculty interact regularly with classroom teachers and K-12 students. University faculty are encouraged and supported through the promotion and tenure processes to conduct research in the schools with school personnel.

Leadership training

The College's partnership with Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) has brought some tangible benefits in terms of leadership training. Over the past five years, ten educators from Hawai'i have traveled to the University of Washington campus for a series of intensive courses on leadership. In a parallel effort at the state level, the Hawai'i Leadership Associates Program, which began in December of 1995, has graduated over 90 teachers, school leaders, and university faculty from the Colleges of Education and Arts and Sciences. The Hawai'i program is designed to achieve three major goals: 1) the simultaneous renewal of schools, 2) the education of those who work in them, and 3) the design and development of educative communities.

Expanding the Partnership

The partnership cannot afford to be complacent about these accomplishments. Indeed, it is our aim to reinvigorate the partnership so that what has been achieved can be consolidated and form the foundation for new partnership endeavors. Several changes in recent years have led to the need for some new thinking on the organization and purposes of the partnership.

First, in the past year, two new leaders have taken on the central educational roles in the state: Randy Hitz, Dean of the College of Education and Paul LeMahieu, State Superintendent. Both are experienced in, and committed to, the idea

of educational partnerships.

Dr Randy Hitz was appointed by the Board of Regents as the sixth Dean of the College of Education at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM) in May, 1998. Hitz has considerable experience in building school/university partnerships in his previous work as Dean of Montana State University College of Education. He also served in the Oregon Department of Education under Governor Goldshmit, where he helped to establish two new state programs with strong partnership components linking schools, universities, and other agencies such as Head Start.

Dr Paul LeMahieu was appointed Superintendent of the Hawai'i Department of Education (DOE) in September, 1998. Prior to that, he served as the Executive Director of the Delaware Education Research and Development Center, while, concurrently, holding positions as Associate Professor of Education at the University of Delaware and Special Undersecretary for Education Research and Development with the Delaware State Department of Education.

Drs LeMahieu and Hitz bring a strong commitment to the idea of partnerships and specifically to the practical challenges of continuing to develop a meaningful partnership between the State DOE and the UHM College of Education. The first step in renewing the partnership has been to expand it by involving all the major stakeholders, including the Colleges of Arts and Sciences at Mānoa and the Curriculum Research and Development Group. This expansion of the Partnership is reflected in membership at the executive level as well as at the level of the team who are responsible for the daily operations of HIEP.

In fall semester, 1998, the Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences were invited to join HIEP as equal partners. This invitation was received enthusiastically. They provided release time for one faculty member to work as a co-director of HIEP, and selected Dr Judith Hughes, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, to serve on the executive committee. This action formally recognized the importance of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences to the partnership endeavors, and built upon earlier contributions from various faculty members and administrators.

Dr Hughes brings to the partnership a background in social studies education from the University of Michigan and a commitment to quality education at all levels. For the past three years, she has devoted considerable time to improving arts education in the K-12 schools. As the representative for the Colleges of Arts and Sciences in the HIEP, she will be responsible for involving the various arts and sciences more directly in teacher education and professional development.

Dr Art King, Director of the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG) of the University of Hawai'i, has also accepted an invitation to join the HIEP executive

board. Dr King had been one of the participants in the earlier educational partnership's activity on school reform for students at risk. A long-standing member of the Graduate Faculty in Education, with affiliation to the Departments of Educational Foundations and Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies, his major contribution to education in Hawai'i is that of a founder and Director of the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG), which includes the University Laboratory School. The staff of the CRDG conducts standards-based curriculum design, curriculum and educational materials development, educational publishing, staff development, and evaluation. CRDG staff also take part in a wide variety of academic and professional tasks at the College, other units of the University, and the Department of Education.

The partnership is now organized around three major, independent though complementary, projects: partner school development, facilitating connections between arts and sciences faculty and the schools, and policy research. The partner school component is headed by Joe Zilliox, a faculty member from the College of Education. Dr Zilliox continues the work that the partnership has done with the NNER since it began. The principal challenge for the partnership is to sustain and develop its many partner schools with the goal of meeting national standards for professional development schools.

The Arts and Sciences project is headed by Joy Marsella from the English Department. She has already begun her work by documenting and analyzing the individual activities of A&S faculty in schools, an essential first step in facilitating more connections. This new impetus, building on earlier efforts of arts and sciences faculty in the partnership, will be important in facilitating discussions with COE faculty regarding general education requirements for teacher candidates.

An entirely new initiative of the Partnership is the creation of an Education Policy Research Center coordinated by Tom Stone of CRDG. The purpose of this center is to provide timely and relevant information to policy makers on a variety of education issues. A panel of researchers and a panel of community and education leaders will provide input and direction for the center.

June Uyehara of the State Department of Education provides the link between the DOE and all three projects. The inclusion of members in addition to the DOE and the College of Education is essential if the HIEP is to properly address this mission and reach its full potential. Certainly the addition of Arts and Sciences and the CRDG will greatly strengthen the partnership. Given the inclusive vision of the mission of the partnership, we intend to carefully consider other education stakeholders in Hawai'i as participants, including membership in the Executive Committee.

Defining the Partnership

In order to take a first step in renewing the partnership, the executive board members met to outline a set of common goals and agree on roles and responsibilities. The following definition was prepared for the new HIEP Charter.

An educational partnership represents a planned effort to establish a formal, mutually beneficial relationship characterized by:

- Equal authority and intellectual status in making collaborative decisions;
- Sufficient overlap in functions and goals to make shared responsibility and the potential benefits of collaboration clearly apparent;
- Respect for and responsiveness to the unique needs and perspectives of its members;
- An effort to develop values and practices that promote a system of shared responsibilities in addressing educational problems.

The mission of the HIEP is to facilitate and support working relationships among a wide variety of educational, community, social and business organizations to address issues of educational practice and policy through collaboration, scholarship, inquiry and action. The philosophical base of this mission is a shared commitment to a set of professional responsibilities:

- The central purpose of education is to prepare citizens for participation in a contemporary democratic society;
- Schools should provide equal educational opportunity for all students;
- Educators should nurture intellectual, social, and emotional growth for all students;
- Educators should assume responsibility for the total quality of their schools, institutions, and organizations.
- Schools should relate appropriately to other community organizations that serve children, youth, and families.

Future Directions

After clarifying our mission and establishing a set of common goals for the new partnership, our next step was to

identify four priorities that are intended to guide our efforts in the future.

Partner Schools

Improved teacher education will continue to be of primary importance to the HIEP. Caring, competent teachers are essential to improving education and both the COE and DOE remain committed to working together to prepare the best possible teachers and to support them in their professional development.

The field placements of UHM students are extremely important for it is in those placements that our future teachers learn most about schools and the teaching/learning process. We face a dilemma, however, for potentially competing goals are at work. On the one hand, we want to place future teachers with the very best mentor teachers. We also want to place these future teachers (and the UHM faculty) in schools that have major challenges and need support in reform efforts. Our challenge is to find placements that meet both of these needs. We need criteria and processes for selecting partner school sites, which addresses both needs in a fair and public way. (Snyder, 1999).

The strength of the partnership has been the relationships developed by individual UHM faculty and school personnel. Similarly, strong individual associations have long characterized productive relationships. What we seek to do is move beyond such individual commitment to institutional commitment. The HIEP needs to find a way to foster these important individual relationships while also "institutionalizing" and making more permanent, the criteria and process for partner school selection.

Our present 41 partner schools are at different levels of maturity. Some have teachers who are very knowledgeable of the teacher education program and fully committed to working with it. Research is taking place in some schools, but not as much in others. All of our partner schools should seek the kind of maturity suggested by the evolving NCATE standards and the five critical attributes for professional development schools:

- a learning community characterized by norms and practices that support children's and adults' learning;
- joint work between and among school and university faculty;
- accountability to the public and to the profession for upholding professional standards;
- allocation of time and resources to systematize the continuous improvement of teaching and learning; and
- establishment of norms and practices that promote equity and learning by all students and adults (Levine, 1999).

Arts and Sciences

We believe there is potential for increased involvement of faculty in the arts and sciences in the partner schools. It is primarily through the arts and sciences that teachers obtain their general education and academic subject knowledge. Teacher education will be improved if links between subject matter education and teacher education are strengthened and the pedagogical preparation and field experiences provided through the College of Education and the schools. During the coming year, faculty and advisers from the Colleges of Arts and Sciences will find better ways to identify and advise incoming freshmen who indicate an interest in becoming teachers. They will examine core courses with a view to creating some sections primarily for prospective teachers, and establish new and better ways for classroom teachers to stay current in their subject areas.

Policy study

There is no systematic, organized effort to understand, define, prioritize, and study educational issues of importance to the public, educators, and policy makers in Hawai'i. The resources that do exist to address major education issues have not necessarily been channeled in the right direction. Furthermore, there is no group in Hawai'i currently assigned with the task of deciding which major educational issues need to be addressed. Consequently, policy makers, educators, and others are too often left with incomplete or inaccurate data and information.

We believe the HIEP provides an important service to the State of Hawai'i by creating a Hawai'i Educational Policy Center (HEPC) which will provide objective, data-based information in the form of policy reports regarding education policy, programming and practices at all levels. The primary audience for HEPC publications will be policy makers, including education and business leaders, legislators, members of the Board of Education, and members of the Board of Regents.

The HEPC will create the infrastructure to support data-based decision making and use data sources such as the U.S. Census, National Center for Educational Statistics, the results of research produced by the College faculty, and data produced by the Hawai'i State Department of Education. The Center will also conduct studies and analyses that inform policy discussions. Examples of issues that may be addressed include: class size in Hawai'i, discipline, transition from preschool to kindergarten, family preference for private education, literacy, Hawaiian language immersion, teacher preparation and professional development, teachers qualifications for their field of assignment, as well as education costs and funding.

A committee consisting of educators, policy makers, business leaders, and representatives of parent groups has been convened to assist with deciding research priorities, channeling resources toward addressing these priorities, and obtaining funds for education research in Hawai'i. A panel of researchers and policy specialists has also been formed to further the work.

Funding

There is also work to be done in making sure that general fund money is available for the partnership school activities. Grant money has been used to fund much of the partnership work, including professional development for UHM faculty and school personnel. Our challenge in the future will be to find a way to fund these core functions of the HIEP without depending on temporary grants. If these functions are important (and we think they are) they should be funded out of the base budget. This will, of course, require priority setting and, until new money is available, reallocation and focusing of resources.

Final Thoughts

Much has been learned about the UHM/DOE Partnership. Many specifics that would serve to strengthen it are recorded throughout the articles in this issue. We also have some general reflections on the nature of the partnership that we have learned through these efforts. These thoughts constitute a persistent challenge to our efforts, a challenge to ensure the legitimacy and viability of the partnership. We have learned that a *bona fide* partnership requires at least four elements:

- Common goals;
- Shared values;
- Equal power and
- Real work to do.

The first two are fairly widely held and easily understood. A good partnership forges a commonly held direction regarding its aims and aspirations. Moreover, it pursues those ends through activities that are imbued with a shared sense of values. Such shared values not only ensure the coherence of the activities through commonly held dispositions; they also sustain the partnership in times of stress or difficulty. We have learned, that in such times, nothing encourages persistence and enduring commitment so much as a bedrock foundation of shared values.

The second two elements, however, are not so commonly found in partnering activity. The prospect of equal power is a challenge to all partners. It suggests that each comes to the

partnership expecting both, to influence and to be influenced, through the union. This is quite different from arrangements in which one partner seemingly expects more influence than the others, creates conditions conducive to its own organization's benefit, or sets out to achieve their own goals. Our vision of partnership anticipates mutual influence and it is predicated on the faith that both common goals and shared values will ensure that mutual influence will benefit the partners individually, at the same time that they push the common agenda along.

The last element seems so obvious as to be trivial, yet we are struck by how often it is omitted. Many times organizations or institutions join together to promote partnerships but do so in the abstract only. The result can be a frustrating series of conversations full of goodwill without purpose and ultimately lacking in accomplishment. We are convinced that partnerships thrive best where there is real work to do. That is, they are best formed as a consequence of applying common goals, shared values, and equal power in the pursuit of genuine accomplishment.

References

- Goodlad, J.I. (1990) *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Levine, M. (1999) Designing standards that work for professional development schools. In Levine, M. (Eds.) *Designing standard that work for Professional development schools: commissioned papers of the NCATE PDS Standards Project* (pp. 1-10). Washington, DC: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Snyder, J. (1999). Finance and policy structures that support the sustenance of Professional development schools. In Levine, M. (Eds.) *Designing standard that work for Professional development schools: commissioned papers of the NCATE PDS Standards Project* (pp. 155-190). Washington, DC: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.
-

Evolution of a Collaborative Partnership

Joseph Zilliox

Informal partnerships among Hawai'i's educational institutions have always existed, and have arisen, over the years, out of shared goals and the desire to meet the educational needs of the State. In 1986, however, with the establishment of the Hawai'i School University Partnership (HSUP), a formal, institutionalized partnership was created. The partnership has evolved since then, adapting to new needs, and integrating new functions while maintaining a core commitment to field-based teacher education and the professional renewal of schools and teachers. Its latest iteration is in the form of a newly conceived and expanded partnership, the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HIEP).

This work has created a set of common ideals between the College of Education, the Department of Education, and other educational institutions across the state. These ideals, moreover, possess close affiliations with national agendas including those set by the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) and the Holmes Group (a group formed by a number of the top schools of education across the United States). The fundamental ideals, which form the basis of the partnership, have held fast even though the mission statement itself has been revised and rewritten many times. Regardless of institutional rhetoric, the collaboration is based on effective working relationships among members of the institute. Thus, the quality of these relationships helps determine the quality of the partnership.

My aim in this article, as one of the current partnership directors, is to provide a short account of past partnership efforts, and offer my perspectives and commentary on the relationships that others have worked so hard to sustain. In addition, I will describe some of the work that the Partnership must undertake as it moves forward to meet new challenges in teacher education and school reform.

HSUP

University faculty, classroom teachers, and school administrators have often worked together and have developed mutual relationships that support the placement and supervision of student teachers and administrative interns. Similar informal partnership efforts have also supported the writing and implementation of grants and curricula, school renewal and curriculum efforts, and numerous other cooperative projects between schools and the university. This work was often perceived as service and was undertaken because of the common interests and goals of the participants. It is such

successful, collaborative efforts as these that have formed the strong foundations on which the formal and current partnerships of today have been built.

Institutional recognition of the partnership occurred in 1986 with the establishment of the HSUP. The founding five-member board of directors were: Jack Darvill, president of Kamehameha Schools; John Dolly, Dean of the College of Education; Charles Toguchi, State Superintendent of Education; Sakae Loo, Windward District Superintendent and Edward Nakano, Leeward District Superintendent. At first, the day-to-day operations of the Partnership were under the directorship of Frederick Elliston, a faculty member from the Curriculum Research and Development Group at the University of Hawai'i. Sadly, Fred was involved in a fatal accident after only 6 months at the helm and Juvenna Chang from Kamehameha Schools was appointed as the executive director in his place.

The three inaugurating agencies—the University of Hawai'i, College of Education (COE); the State of Hawai'i Department of Education (DOE) and the Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate (KS/BE)—grouped to form the Partnership out of a concern for students whose behavior placed them “at-risk” of failing and dropping out of school. The DOE was looking for ways to promote greater school success for at-risk students. The COE wanted to ensure that the preservice teachers who received their initial teacher education through the college were prepared to address the needs of at-risk students. Kamehameha Schools, a private institution whose mission involved serving children of native Hawaiian ancestry, was concerned that the at-risk population included a disproportionate number of Hawaiian children.

While the needs of at-risk students brought the partners together to solve an issue of common concern, the partners soon expanded their agenda to address other important educational issues. In total, the Partnership formed four task forces to address several important reform issues. The School Success Task Force sought to generate support for individual schools to increase their ability to meet the special needs of at-risk students. The Teacher Pre-service Education Task Force was charged with rethinking teacher education at the University of Hawai'i. The Task Force on Leadership Preparation took on the challenge of improving the preparation of school administrators. Finally, the Exemplary Sites Task Force was formed to develop exemplary field sites for both preservice teachers and trainee principals.

Connection to the National Conversation

In 1986, the COE was accepted as a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal headed by John Goodlad and his associates at the University of Washington in Seattle. By 1992, the NNER included 17 sites composed of 25 teacher education institutions and over 300 elementary and secondary school partners.

Membership in the NNER meant that, as a participating site, the HSUP agreed to support and pursue a NNER agenda, which is based on the principle that quality teacher preparation and school renewal are tightly linked.

Membership in the NNER conferred a strong philosophical base of ideas and a vision for the renewal of schools and teacher education programs. In addition, the NNER provided the HSUP with access to the experiences of other member institutions, with opportunities to compare the quality work being done in Hawai'i with other member institutions and to disseminate our results, and opportunities to build extended professional relationships through site visitation and research projects. NNER professional staff were now available for consultation and provided opportunities to bring local constituents together.

Between 1992 and 1998, ten educators from all partner institutions of HSUP were selected and supported by NNER to participate in the Associates Program based at the University of Washington. Associates engaged in discussions on reform issues with their fellows from across the United States. They brainstormed ideas for implementing the NNER agenda, and they conducted a number of inquiry projects that would help to further their understanding of how to undertake reform in their own institutions.

From its beginning in 1986, several important changes have occurred in HSUP memberships and leadership. In 1992, the Kamehameha Schools left the partnership when its board of trustees initiated a refocusing of the Bishop Estate's educational efforts. At this time, the full-time director's position was replaced with two half-time positions. Antonette Port joined as a director from the DOE and Philip Whitesell, who had been Associate Dean of Teacher Education, represented the College's contribution. Under their joint leadership, the partnership continued to build strong connections with other sites across the country and sustained the Partnership's emphasis on quality teacher preparation and local school renewal.

In 1995, the State Legislature requested that the University establish a "Center for Teacher Education and Partner Schools (Omnibus Education Act of 1994)." An outcome of this initiative and after three years of planning is that the DOE and the COE of the University of Hawai'i has now

established a Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HIEP) as a successor agency to the HSUP.

HSUP/HIEP Accomplishments

It is impossible to name all those who deserves credit for the accomplishments of the Partnership over the past 13 years and to identify specific contributions and the combined efforts that have led to many of the changes that have taken place in the College and at partner schools. Indeed, partnerships by their very nature are not the work of individuals, but benefit from the synergy that comes when people work productively together. In general, however, the accomplishments of the Partnership can be clustered into three overlapping areas: field-based teacher preparation, school renewal, and teacher leadership.

The influence of the NNER and the HSUP is now clearly established in several areas. In public schools and College teacher preparation programs, ideas from the NNER agenda have been influential at the planning stages and are evident in many of the changes that have been implemented. Those involved at all levels of the Partnership from faculty, teachers, and administrators have been instrumental in contributing to these changes. At the same time individual educators, some with and some without NNER connections, have been a driving force behind the reforms that have occurred and continue to occur under the partnership umbrella. It is often their personal vision and day-to-day drive that have sustained many of the accomplishments that follow.

Field-based teacher education. Over the twelve-year period from 1987 to 1999, the COE has planned and implemented three teacher preparation programs that are designed to rely on partnership model for their implementation. Some of the components for these programs were first tried out in the Pre-Service Education for Teachers of Minorities (PETOM) program. PETOM was an early cooperative effort between KS/BE and the COE. The program placed an emphasis on student cohorts, mentoring, and targeting of a specific pre-service teacher population.

The Master of Education in Teaching (MET), admitted its first cohort of students in 1991. The MET offers a graduate level degree in teacher education as well as preparing students for professional certification with the DOE. Candidates are required to hold an undergraduate degree in a field other than education. MET student teachers work in one of four partner schools for two years of intensive field-based work that culminates in a full semester-long internship during the final year.

The restructured BEd in Elementary Education began in 1994 as an initial certification program. Students are required to complete a minimum of 360 hours of progressively more intense field experiences in K-6 schools over the first three

semesters before they begin a final semester of student teaching.

The third initial certification program is the Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Secondary Education (PBCSE) which began in 1997 and offers certification for non-education majors. Students complete a year of education courses and field experiences including a full semester of student teaching.

Those who teach in these programs must learn to interact with their students in field experiences—a very different setting from the college classroom. The presence of College faculty at school sites is intended to create more productive relationships between student teachers and partner-school teachers. Faculty also aim to build meaningful connections between theoretical perspectives in university coursework and daily classroom practices, involve classroom teachers and school administrators more directly in teacher preparation and decision making, and endeavor to support school renewal efforts.

Partner Schools. The development of partner schools is a second important area of the Partnership's accomplishments. The main idea of the partner school is that it provides a setting for the renewal of teacher preparation by placing student teachers in schools that are committed to their own renewal and where teachers are actively engaged in professional development. The school becomes a partner in the preparation and development of beginning teachers and the university becomes a partner with the elementary, middle or secondary school on its renewal process.

As many as 40 schools have participated in some form or another in the College's teacher education programs. Teacher preparation programs now enroll a total of more than 350 students each year, and involve the participation of 45 faculty from across the College and over 300 classroom teachers from partner schools.

Educational Leadership. The Hawai'i Leadership Associates Program (HLAP) began in December of 1995, following the model set by the NNER Leadership program. The NNER program is designed to address two major needs in our educational system:

- the simultaneous effort to renew schools and improve teacher education
- the design and development of educative communities.

HLAP started by engaging professional educators from the DOE, the COE and the Colleges of Arts and Sciences in discussions on the NNER agenda. From 1995 to the present, over 90 associates have participated in a series of intensive sessions designed to encourage dialogue and the development of inquiry projects.

In addition to these major efforts, the Partnership has pursued funding for the operations of HIEP and has been able to provide funds to support numerous activities related to partner school development and school renewal. Courses on mentoring, school curriculum, and action research have been offered to classroom teachers at minimal cost to the participants. Small, classroom-based inquiry projects have received funding. Preservice teachers have received materials to implement innovative projects in their classrooms. Faculty, graduate students, and classroom teachers have been funded to travel to both local and national conferences to make presentations. The annual partnership conference has provided a forum for teachers and leadership associates to present their inquiry projects and to discuss issues related to teacher preparation and school renewal.

The partnership has been able to support these activities with financial and in-kind help from member institutions, as well as through grants from the NNER and the DeWitt Wallace Foundation. Money was also obtained from a Goals 2000 grant for reforming pre-service teacher education.

The Partnership Renewed

In 1998, each of the two remaining institutions in the partnership, the DOE and COE, came under new leadership. The new Superintendent of Education, Paul LeMahieu, and the new Dean of the College, Randy Hitz, then, took over as executive directors. Both saw the need to broaden the partnership by adding new partners and undertaking fresh projects. As a result, two other institutions have recently joined the Partnership. The University of Hawai'i Colleges of Arts and Sciences (A&S), which is composed of four separate colleges (Arts and Humanities; Languages, Linguistics, and Literature; Natural Sciences and Social Sciences), are now represented as full members in the partnership. Faculty from these colleges have participated in past partnership activities and have always been active in public schools but often on an individual basis. As they seek a wider presence in the preparation of teachers and the renewal of public education, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences are now contributing time and resources to the Partnership and are represented by an executive board member and HIEP director.

In its charter, the mission of the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships is stated as follows: To bring together a wide variety of educational, community, social and business organizations to address issues of educational practice and policy through collaboration, scholarship, inquiry and action.

... The Institute functions to promote, facilitate, and support the development of educational partnerships that result in the simultaneous improvement of the quality of education in Hawai'i's schools and the preparation of educators. To carry out these functions, the

Institute encourages innovation, assists in linking prospective initiatives by providing a collaborative setting for innovation to occur, and promotes and facilitates exemplary professional development sites for educators. (Charter, 1999)

The functions represented above signify the Partnership's commitment to a primary set of ethical ideals or professional responsibilities: preparing citizens for participation in a democratic society; providing equal opportunities for intellectual development; nurturing social and emotional growth of all students and assuming responsibility for the total quality of partner schools, institutions and organizations.

The second major development of the Partnership under the leadership of Dean Hitz and Superintendent LeMahieu is the addition of a new Hawai'i Educational Policy Center (HEPC). The HEPC was established to provide an appropriate research base for educational improvement. The center, therefore, is adding an important organizational component that will provide informed opinion on matters vital to the Partnership, including teacher preparation and school renewal.

HIEP is governed by an executive board composed of the head educational officers of the partnership institutions. Currently, the Executive Board members are Paul LeMahieu, State Superintendent of Schools; Randy Hitz, Dean, College of Education; Judith Hughes, Dean of the College of Arts and Humanities, who represents the four Deans that make up the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Arthur King, director of the Curriculum Research and Development Group (CRDG). The daily operations of the organization are the responsibility of four part-time directors. Jane Uyehara represents the DOE; Joy Marsella, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences; Joseph Zilliox, COE and Thomas Stone of CRDG. Representatives from the public schools and university programs supported by the partnership form an advisory council that meets regularly to provide assistance in partnership activities and expenditures.

Challenges Facing the Partnership

Experience tells us that there is always a gap between the ideals of an institution and the implementation of those ideals. In the previous section of this article, I have attempted to lay out the elements of these ideals and explain, however briefly, an account of the evolution of the Partnership. As far as the matter of the implementation of these reforms is concerned, however, the real world often fails to match up to the ideal. Nevertheless, it is these real world problems that must be engaged if the partnership and its participating members are to deal effectively with implementing lasting educational reforms. In this concluding section, therefore, I would like to present what I see as the major challenges that face the partnership. I present these

challenges from my perspective as someone who has been involved in the Partnership for some years: first, as a faculty member working with a cohort of students and mentor teachers at a partner school; second, as the program chair of the elementary program; third, as a participant in the NNER associate program and now as one of the co-directors of HIEP.

The first challenge deals with developing partner schools as effective institutions within the state. Our claim has been that the partnership includes more than 40 partner schools. In program literature we make claims such as: "It takes a school to make (educate) a teacher." But generalized claims of this sort tend to be misleading. They present an image of over 40 schools with teachers and university faculty on a common path working towards school renewal and teacher education reform.

The reality is that the partnerships are extremely diverse. At one end of the spectrum a "partner" school can be little more than a site for the placement of a few college students who are assigned to a classroom for several hours a week. These arrangements look and feel no different from traditional student teaching settings. Little or no conversation about professional development takes place, and there is little evidence of an effort to integrate theory and practice. At the other end of the spectrum, university faculty, classroom teachers, and school administrators share the work of preparing teachers and redefining their mission to public education. Teachers have opportunities to contribute to the experiences of the preservice teachers; they often co-teach university courses or contribute as guest speakers, activities that go far beyond the traditional role of mentor teacher. In these schools, university faculty are seen in public school classrooms working with pre-service teachers, school children, and teachers. Courses for students and teachers are offered on-site rather than at the university. School administrators include university student teachers as members of the school community, involving them in staff development activities and other social and academic functions.

In effect, a wide range of institutional arrangements have become established that are uniformly designated as partner schools. Correspondingly, a wide range of relationships has become established between partner schools and the different College programs associated with them. Simply calling a school a partner school because it has been included within the formal or big "P" Partnership does a disservice to the arrangement. Such formal recognition is not a guarantee that the small "p" partner relationships, so essential to the proper evolution of partner schools, will occur. It is these partnerships, however, the ones between real people that play themselves out in one-on-one activities, day in and day out, that it is essential for the big "P" Partnership to nurture and develop.

These relationships are fragile. Participants are visitors on each other's turf. Each is busy with the details of their own life and professional work, and building and sustaining a new working relationship takes time and energy. Yet it is the strength and nature of these relationships that determine the quality of the partnership and ultimately affect the quality of the program at a particular setting.

A second area that presents a challenge to the Partnership arises as a result of the ways that change has been implemented. The various programs really have grown out of somewhat divergent beliefs about how teacher education reforms are to be implemented. The challenge is to bring the programs closer together through sharing and by establishing an agreed-on set of values that unite all the programs. This work is already underway.

The faculty recently agreed on a set of conceptual themes for the College—collaboration, inclusion, dynamism, inquiry, and reflection—as part of its plan to seek national accreditation through the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. In addition, our work with the NNER has been beneficial in promoting a common set of ideal, goals, and practices.

Despite the Goodlad agenda and the College conceptual themes, more thought and energy will be necessary if we are to implement a shared vision across programs. We need to develop ownership of the vision by unpacking the ideas inherent in the themes and be clear about how they work in practice. We have often appropriated the vocabulary of the vision into descriptions of our programs and activities. The challenge we now face is to evaluate how well we have put this vision into practice. It is essential that we talk across cohorts and programs to see what lies behind the various efforts and, at the same time, acknowledge and respect diversity without allowing the gaps between our practices to widen.

In many ways this is a dilemma. One of the strengths of our programs has been the flexibility with which coordinators have been able to initiate and experiment with program organization. But because so much of what happens at a particular setting is dependent on the individuals currently involved and the working relationships they have established, it is almost impossible to replicate the program when those individuals are no longer available to continue. Coordinators, principals, faculty members, and groups of teachers often become closely identified with a program so that there is a real risk that the program might not continue when and if the key people depart. The challenge is to create programs where strong relationships can thrive and where success is not tied to a small group who are identified as essential to the program.

A third challenge is to recognize and reward the accomplishments of teachers and faculty who do the work well and

to develop alternative roles for classroom teachers, school administrators, and faculty other than College of Education faculty. While some faculty have expanded their roles into schools, we have not opened the door to expanded roles for others in the partnership. In many ways this seems to be tied to the reward structure. Faculty tend to worry about this work not being acknowledged through the university reward system. Teachers view this differently and honor the contributions that faculty can make in partner school situations.

Classroom teachers and school administrator define workload in terms of the grade they teach or the school unit they oversee. Their time and energy spent mentoring preservice teachers, nurturing partnership relationships, and serving the partnership in other forms often go unacknowledged and un-rewarded. Teachers and administrators report that they continue in this effort because they see the benefit for their children that comes from the presence of a preservice program in their schools. They claim personal growth results from their mentoring and interaction with university students and faculty, and they welcome opportunities to be involved in the profession at a different level. Because the obvious benefits of release time and financial compensation are limited or non-existent, the partnership relationship can, therefore, appear to be one-sided.

In at least one endeavor, the MET program, roles for teachers have some status, require more than just letting a student complete field work in their classrooms, and carry some compensation in terms of release time to interact with colleagues and engage in professional development opportunities. In other programs, this is not the case. Beyond the token financial compensation a teacher receives for serving as mentor, we have yet to find alternative roles for them. Some have assumed roles as teacher leaders or as liaison persons for a program that is implemented in their school, but we have not made these roles a recognized part of the program. Somehow, the notion of partnership is weakened by this lack of inclusion of teachers in more significant roles.

In presenting these challenges, I acknowledge that this recent iteration of the partnership is surely not the last. Though a firm groundwork has been laid, opportunities and challenges remain. By enlarging the partnership we seek to continue this work by reaching out and embracing a larger educational community. By continuing to address our challenges in a collaborative spirit, we can create change and bring about simultaneously, the renewal of schools and teacher education.

Joseph Zilliox is an associate professor in the department of teacher education and curriculum studies at the College of Education, University of Hawai'i-Mānoa.

A School/University Partnership from a School Perspective

Nanna S Brantigan, Ann E Foley and Karen S McElliott

Our leadership team at College Place Middle School will never forget the week in May, 1989 when we received word that we had been selected as one of the twenty-one grant recipients in the state of Washington to receive a “Schools for the Twenty-First Century” award. At the same time, we had been chosen as one of 4 middle schools to become a professional development school in partnership with the University of Washington. The staff had planned for this restructuring for over two years, and the process of selection for the state grant had taken over a year. In contrast, the process of applying to partner with the University of Washington as a Professional Development Center site lasted a short and intense two weeks.

Though the staff was barely familiar with the requirements of the project, teachers at our school had always been willing to assist in the training of student teachers. An additional incentive was that the Schools for the Twenty-first Century grant provided ten additional work days over the next six years for each staff member for training, planning, and implementing the school’s proposal to raise student achievement through school restructuring. The years following this momentous week proved to be rich, rewarding, and marked by intense personal and professional growth and changes within the school system. Teachers assumed greater responsibility for student learning and welcomed new leadership roles. Within this dynamic and sometimes chaotic environment, the formal partnership of College Place Middle School with the University of Washington was born. For four years, our school staff worked collaboratively with our new partners. Our joint mission was to develop a teacher preparation program designed specifically for middle level teachers while, at the same time, offering opportunities for the professional growth of practicing teachers. Our overall aim was to promote school change to meet the needs of adolescents. Why, then, after six productive years did the partnership end?

In this paper we wish to explore what we learned from these four intense, dynamic and productive years. How were partner relationships established and strengthened over the years? What made this effort so important to the leadership at the school and University? What impact did the sudden curtailment of the project have on those who participated in it? Why is it that those who took part in it, even today, four years after it has ended, find it painful to talk or write about it?

We offer, in answer to these questions, a brief history of the

Puget Sound Professional Development Center (PSPDC). In addition, we offer our reflections as three school leaders—the site supervisor, the teacher leader coordinator, and the partnership school principal—each of whom played a significant role in the planning and implementing the project.

A Brief History of the Puget Sound Professional Development Center

The Puget Sound Professional Development Center was a project of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium composed of 12-14 districts surrounding the city of Seattle as well as the Seattle School District. The participants included the University of Washington and four middle school sites in four different school districts. Each district was expected to make a \$10,000 annual contribution. The project received additional funding and support from the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, and the Metropolitan Life Foundation. In spite of this early support, it proved difficult in later years to sustain the same level of funding. Efforts to lobby the Washington State Legislature for a more stable source proved unsuccessful as the state turned its attention to funding different reform efforts in the K-12 system.

The Professional Development Center (PDC), nevertheless, was able to enjoy adequate funding for three of the four years. These funds supported collaborative planning and implementation of a highly successful program to train new middle school teachers while, simultaneously, providing the means to enable continuous professional development of our teachers.

During the fourth year, with funds growing scarce, the Puget Sound Education Consortium turned over the formal supervision of the project to the University of Washington. Soon, new cracks began to appear in the Consortium as districts experienced the pressure to move limited funds into other areas. The fourth year found the PDC functioning with less and less money. One of the four original schools opted out for “a period of rest.” The University was now in the difficult position of maintaining two programs simultaneously: the new middle level preparation program as well as the traditional teacher education program. Unfortunately, financial constraints at the university level forced them to combine the programs. As a result, the University combined what they could of the best aspects of the middle level program into the old program; those, at any rate, that could be adapted to meet budget demands.

In spite of this merger, the program has continued to evolve. Today, forty-five Partner Schools work with University of Washington student teachers. College Place Middle School continues its participation as one of those partner schools and our faculty still considers the training of new teachers to be an important part of their work. They remain committed to the goal of preparing excellent new teachers who will also be successful agents of change in their new places of employment. We are pleased to report that over the past two years we have been able to hire two of these new graduates to replace teachers who have retired.

The Role of the Site Supervisor

One of the major innovations in the development of the school/university partnership was in the supervision of student teachers. In the traditional program, supervisors from the university were assigned pre-service teachers in several school districts. With several student teachers assigned to one school, the Professional Development Center model created the position of site supervisor within each building. Supervisors were responsible for familiarizing the pre-service teachers with the building and school rules, holding weekly meetings to clarify problems or issues, coordinating the student teachers and cooperating teachers, observing and evaluating the student teachers and for meeting monthly with the university teaching team and other site supervisors.

This new role created new opportunities for teachers and encouraged the development of many new partnerships. Within each school, for example, the supervisor established a different quality of collegiality with cooperating teachers. There was a significant increase in discussions and evaluations of teaching practices. And because four site schools were involved, the supervisors had opportunities to develop relationships with each other. They became partners in defining and creating the new roles and responsibilities of the job.

One of the most rewarding partnerships came from the close working relationship with university faculty. The professors in the program were open and collegial in their work with teachers. The monthly meetings between the university teaching team and the site supervisors were opportunities for partnerships in the development of curriculum and learning activities. Ideas from the schools and supervisors were considered and often integrated into the coursework. Our commitment to the program and the intensity of the work brought staff from the site schools and university closer together and friendships and professional connections developed that centered on a core of common goals. We were all committed to the same central goal of providing a strong middle school focus for the student teachers. It was to this goal that we continually referred back

to in our discussions and decision-making.

When the university phased out the middle school program and transformed the teacher education program into the current Teacher Education Program (TEP), the position of site supervisor was one of the PDC middle school components that was retained. The student teachers in the PDC program frequently mentioned that the site supervisor was the main strength of the entire program. They liked the close access to the supervisor, who was able to link the theoretical content of university classes with the practice of the cooperating teachers.

Though several aspects of the position have been retained, some adaptations from the original site supervisor role have been made. The site coordinator still orients pre-service teachers to the building and school policies; they still schedule time with cooperating teachers and they continue to conduct weekly seminars. However, the site coordinators no longer meet with the professors to discuss curriculum, assignments, and common concerns. Formal classroom observations and evaluations are now the responsibility of the university supervisor. It has not been possible to maintain the close working relationship between university professors and site coordinators that had developed in the middle school program.

The Puget Sound Professional Development Center was based on a series of beliefs that included new roles and responsibilities for educators, and that these would be supported through dialogue and inquiry on professional development. The focus on continual learning and renewal of practice created a spirit of collegiality and a sense of purpose for the teachers at the sites. Because there were additional funds and only four school sites involved in the program, it was easier to provide time and staff development to support these beliefs. These circumstances helped to form a culture in which cooperating teachers could move from their traditional role with student teachers to one that made them positive role models and reflective practitioners. These partnerships, involving close personal working relationships among different role groups, helped to develop trust, create a climate of mutual respect, and established a shared commitment to partnership goals.

Two questions now confront the TEP: Can the relationships fostered in the middle school program be replicated in the new program? Can schools and teachers create the same level of commitment and partnership if they do not enjoy the same opportunities to participate in decision-making processes that are integral to the operations of the program? Our experience tells us that the answer to both questions is probably, "No."

The initial partnership between the university and the schools worked effectively to promote teacher professional development and teacher preparation. Teachers at the sites took advantage of professional development opportunities.

The site supervisors and cooperating teachers grew in their pedagogical knowledge and became more reflective as a result. They also had opportunities to work with university faculty to build a solid program. Pre-service teachers had an excellent training experience because all those involved in the program invested considerable time and effort in their success. This partnership worked because it was practiced on a small scale by people who were able to meet together regularly and solve problems collaboratively.

The current program does not have the same feeling of partnership. The TEP program possesses some strengths, but the partnerships that were so integral to the middle school teacher education program are now of a different nature. Preservice teachers continue to collaborate with each other in their cohort groups. Cooperating teachers, pre-service teachers, and site coordinators form partnerships within the school. But the close working relationships that were so effective in promoting teacher professional development and school renewal are no longer in existence.

Could the Professional Development Center exist today and foster the same type of partnerships? Probably not. The time, energy, and funding needed to replicate the PSPDC model on a large scale would be prohibitive. The Professional Development Center was established not just to create a more effective teacher education program; it was also created to further the professional development of experienced teachers. The teacher education program has continued to thrive. However, the emphasis of each of the schools in the partnership has shifted, and although teachers continue to focus on their own staff development, there has been a major redirection of energies away from systemic reforms towards an emphasis on curriculum standards and performance-based assessment.

The Role of the Teacher Leader Coordinator

The role of the Teacher Leader Coordinator (TLC) had two main functions: to consult with the TLCs at three other middle schools and the project director from the University of Washington and to coordinate the professional development activities at the partnership school.

The first duty was a relatively easy one to accomplish. The four middle school TLCs and the University Project Director met monthly, and although each of us represented a somewhat different school population, many of the problems we faced and much of what we had to do were similar. We relayed site concerns to the project director and each other, debriefed on past events, discussed current activities, and planned future ones. Most of our problem solving revolved around the roadblocks to fuller participation at off-site events. For example, one of the aims of the multi-site PDC was to have events rotate through the four institutions.

However, attendance of teachers tended to be low when events were not held at their school.

Because of our position as experienced teachers in our respective schools, TLCs were able to influence the implementation of university proposals, sometimes to speed them up, at other times to require more time to reconsider the practical implications of new ideas. Shared decision-making worked best when the schools and the university shared common values and interests such as curriculum or teaching methods. We were more likely to disagree about day-to-day matters of school operations such as scheduling issues. For example, the university envisioned PDC sites that would prepare ten pre-service teachers at a time. The TLCs believed that although pre-service education was an essential part of a well-rounded professional development program, a large number of student teachers would be too demanding for the school to handle and affect the quality of student learning. We were concerned that students could have student teachers in most of their classes, and that the same teachers would be tapped as cooperating teachers each year. The program director argued for more student teachers as a cost-saving measure and as a factor in forming a more intense culture in which to immerse teacher interns. However, the teachers tended to look at things differently, assessing the potential impact on the school students, and held student teacher admissions to four or five.

The professional development duties of the TLC at the middle school site were more onerous and diverse. They included coordinating all PDC activities at College Place Middle School (CPMS), assisting activity organizers, organizing events if no one stepped forward to volunteer, acting as a sounding board for faculty concerns, maintaining close contact with the principal, and managing the PDC budget of \$10,000.00 each year.

The largest part of the job was to promote professional growth among teachers. We sponsored workshops, study groups, mini-grants for curriculum development, fireside chats on topics of interest, colloquia (rather formal presentations on a given topic followed by informal discussion), and classes for college credit. A list of events during a single school year demonstrates the scope of these activities:

- two full-day workshops on integrated curriculum,
 - a study group on technology,
 - a study group on William Glasser's quality school,
 - three fireside chats on technology,
 - a district-wide colloquium for middle school teachers focusing on self-directed action research projects,
 - several study sessions with a professor-in-residence on questioning strategies.
-

Sometimes the line between different aspects of the partnership blurred. For example, teachers saw their work with teacher interns as part of their own professional development, not solely part of the pre-service program. In an end-of-the-year survey to measure the amount of participation in professional development, the staff listed 28 separate PDC events.

Not all professional development efforts, however, occurred through courses and workshops. One way was to spread leadership activities throughout the staff. Initially, some teachers were reluctant to take on new roles such as librarian for the professional library, colloquium coordinator, fireside chat facilitator or study group leader. However, when these teachers did accept these new challenges, with the support of the TLC and principal, they discovered that they did have the requisite skills.

While the staff was likely to participate in activities that were on-site and requests that came from staff, they were initially suspicious of the motives of the University. Why did professors want to work with middle school teachers? What were we doing wrong that they wanted to fix?

We felt that the University came to a better understanding of the culture and operating procedures of the school. We came to value our friendship with them, though there were points that we never did fully resolve.

One of the aims of the PSPDC was that each middle school would become a center of professional development for all middle schools in its district. Despite repeated efforts to include the other three middle schools, this never became a reality. Occasionally, one or two teachers from another middle school would attend, but their participation was intermittent. Just as our teachers had been suspicious of the motives of the University of Washington, the other Edmonds middle schools were leery of our school. Who were we to be organizing these activities and telling them what they needed? Why should we have a budget for staff development when they did not have an equal amount?

Although the budget to support professional development activities disappeared, the culture of professional learning has continued. These developments are due in some measure to the intensity with which the staff pursued knowledge and understanding during the years in which both the PDC grants and the Schools for the 21st Century Grant were in operation.

Looking at the current climate of the school nine years later and five years since the formal partnership was dissolved, it is heartening to see that not all of the gains from the PDC have disappeared. We remember the sense of responsibility that the PDC engendered, the belief that what we were creating was imperative for the future of teaching, and that we were on the cutting edge of reform in teacher preparation and professional development. It is disheartening, however,

to imagine how far we might have come if the dream of partnership had survived the cost cutting and the consequent redirection of resources.

The Role of the Principal

At first the time commitment seemed daunting— one day a month away from the building to meet with the PSPDC planning team. The planning team consisted of the University of Washington director, graduate students, the four principals, site supervisors and teacher leader coordinators from each building. Finally, there was the middle school teacher who worked as a teaching associate with the University of Washington staff in the teaching of the student teacher seminars. In addition to holding a middle school teaching assignment, this person was hired to help plan and teach the student teacher seminars that were held twice weekly.

As principal, I came to appreciate highly these frequent days of study and reflection with other professionals who shared my vision of schooling. These monthly meetings were extremely important since it was here that the real partnerships between people were formed, where visions were shared and developed, where communication links were made and trust developed. This offered a contrast with meetings in my own district at which resource issues were creating a more competitive atmosphere among the principals. They were suspicious of a school that had received two major grant awards while they struggled for funds and support for change within their schools.

The partnership organization was simple and non-hierarchical. University faculty organized the details of the agenda and facilitated the meeting. School personnel were thankful for this support as we were extremely busy with many other tasks. Our facilitators kept us strictly on task but always provided time for dialogue. The agenda for our meetings encouraged collaboration with job-alike groups and site groups meeting on an assortment of topics. We always reported to the full group with detailed notes taken by graduate students. In this way, we always knew what others were thinking and planning, and what decisions had been made.

On one occasion, a debate arose on the use of the term, “mastery” and on the use of the state mandated standardized test. We did not always agree, but because we trusted each other, we felt free to speak our mind. At that time, it was the only reliable assessment tool that we had. Our university colleagues tended to be critical of the strategies associated with mastery learning (e.g. memorization of small bits of information). I had to explain constantly that although we were very interested in all our students learning basic skills, we certainly valued and targeted higher level learning. We did not use the standardized test to formulate curriculum.

Even so, the university perspective would still creep into conversations or written documents about our school.

On the other hand, our university colleagues were usually open to new information that came from teachers, though they did advance what we saw as their own theoretical perspectives. The university faculty tended to take a more theory-laden point of view in contrast to the practical orientation of the teachers. This difference was never completely resolved.

Communicating ideas within the school was always a challenge. Our 21st Century grant proposal allowed us seventeen half-day student releases for staff meetings. (We worked a slightly longer school day to allow for this). The Teacher Leader Coordinator had time on the agenda to provide information about the PDC project and to receive input from the staff. The TLC continually surveyed the staff on their needs and on ways to meet them. She encouraged staff to keep journals and promoted action research projects. But many people wondered why we were doing so many things at once. They wondered, for example, how the PDC project fit with the 21st Century grant project. We found it essential to point out the linkages and leverage points between what appeared to be unrelated activities. We viewed our task in terms of helping others to see the big picture. There were “forest” people, who saw the big picture, and the “tree” people, who had difficulty seeing the forest for the trees. The latter group seemed to be in the majority.

An important contribution of the University of Washington director was to nurture the people partnerships and to create a positive climate and caring culture. In each of the four years of the Partnership, we carefully planned and held a formal celebration of the year’s accomplishments. This event was held at a “neutral” location, with the deliberate aim of avoiding the appearance that we were representing simply one side of the partnership. During the ceremony, we “graduated” each new cadre of student teachers. They, in turn, thanked the people who had mentored them. We all said thank you to each other. Small gifts were presented to each of our talented graduate students, who were leaving to start their teaching careers.

Important policy-makers were always invited to this event and many attended. During the year, we rotated the location of the meetings so that we could all take turns at playing host and guest. We often met in at parklike settings where we shared meals and discussed professional issues, informally. We learned to appreciate our professional colleagues as unique individuals. A good laugh was an important tonic, and we developed a shared humor related to the difficulties we sometimes encountered in the project.

One of the biggest hurdles I encountered was how to convince our new superintendent that he should continue to support our professional development activities with the

district’s \$10,000 contribution. Within days of our selection as a PDC site, the district had hired an outstanding new superintendent. He was an excellent leader, but he had no experience working with the Puget Sound Educational Consortium, and he had strong feelings about equitable distribution of resources to schools in the district. Each spring, I faced the difficult task of justifying this expense to other middle school principals, who were openly hostile to it. A more formal commitment with the University (or the Consortium) by the retiring superintendent would have been helpful in securing continued support.

When the formal partnership with the middle school program ended, we continued our role as a partner school. As principal, I continued to see new student teachers come into our program, and the site supervisor continued to support them although no longer as the official supervisor. The teacher leader coordinator continued her excellent teacher leadership work, even though her official title had disappeared. Our staff development, under the mandates set by the district and state government, began to focus heavily on the new state standards and performance assessment procedures. The implementation of a training program specifically for middle level teachers is again on hold. Perhaps, in the future, a new group of leaders will revive it.

Several years after the Puget Sound Professional Development Center project had formally ended, the University of Washington project director recalls running into the two teacher leaders from College Place Middle School at a National Middle School Conference. They were very glad to see each other. This was a meeting of friends. They had worked hard together to actualize an important shared vision for middle level schools. They found that as they shared memories and talked about the project that they still felt very wounded that this effort had died. It was difficult to talk about their work together because it had meant so much to them. Nevertheless, the partnerships and relationships that the Project helped create have survived beyond the demise of the official partnership. Over the years, the original participants have managed to stay in touch professionally, and they know they can count on each other when important work needs to be done. All are still involved in various ways in teacher or principal preparation, professional growth and school renewal.

Nanna S Brantigan is a teacher and site supervisor of student teachers at College Place Middle School in Washington State.

Ann E Foley is the former principal of College Place Middle School, now retired and mentoring principal interns in Seattle.

Karen S McElliot is a Standards and Assessment Specialist with Edmonds School District in Washington State.

Journey of a Blue Ribbon Partnership

William Greene with Kathy Nagaji, Wendy Larrow, Wendy Lum,
Nancy Morikawa, Gloria Shoda, Ray Sugai and Joseph Zilliox

In 1995, while working as a graduate assistant at the University of Hawai'i, I taught a course in educational psychology to a cohort of students placed at Pearl Ridge Elementary School in central O'ahu. I was excited by the prospect of teaching learning theory and concepts that I could relate to contexts where daily examples from students' experiences would be part of our conversations about working with children. Since then, I have continued to build on my experiences at Pearl Ridge with two cohorts of students. The school staff and faculty at the University of Hawai'i provided proof of the power and potential of the school partnership model for training new teachers and for facilitating the renewal of veteran teachers and university instructors. This article looks at some of the characteristics of this partnership through the perceptions of those working within the culture of the public school system in Hawai'i.

The voices that form the text of this article include two Pearl Ridge administrators – Ray Sugai, the principal, and Kathy Nagaji, the school curriculum coordinator. The teachers are represented by kindergarten teacher, Nancy Morikawa; third-grade teacher, Gloria Shoda; fifth-grade teacher, Wendy Lum; and sixth-grade teacher, Wendy Larrow. Joe Zilliox and William Greene are the two university faculty who have been most closely involved with working with the teachers and students at Pearl Ridge.

Two four-semester cycles of cohort students were trained wholly or in part on the Pearl Ridge campus. (A one-semester pilot group preceded both cohorts.) The first cycle accommodated 18 students, all placed at Pearl Ridge. The second cycle involved 27 students who alternated placements between Pearl Ridge and Holomua Elementary School. Examples given in participants' comments relate to either one of the cohort cycles, and some statements summarize more general impressions spanning more than four years of partnership involvement.

The Early Phase: Setting Up a New School-University Partnership

About five years ago, Ann Port, co-director of the Hawai'i School University Partnership, contacted Joe Zilliox to ask if he would be willing to assist Pearl Ridge Elementary School staff in submitting a grant to the Apple Corporation. The grant meetings that followed gave Zilliox, Sugai, Nagaji, Morikawa and others a chance to get to know each other and express a shared commitment to education and children. Joe Zilliox suggested to the group that a math methods course he planning to teach to a group of student teachers at Waiau

Elementary School might meet at Pearl Ridge instead, and that a few of the Waiau students be placed there. Sugai began to have conversations with the rest of his staff about the school becoming involved in a university partnership. After reaching a consensus, the school decided to start modestly by hosting 12 students from the Waiau Cohort as a pilot group. In this way, Pearl Ridge teachers were introduced to the new teacher preparation program being developed in the College of Education. When the time came to begin several new cohorts in the Spring of 1995, the school decided to give it a try with a two-year commitment and starting a cohort of their own. Two full cohort cycles (eight semesters) later, the Pearl Ridge is again planning to take on a new, third cohort next fall.

The responses from a survey of Pearl Ridge mentors and UH faculty have identified some common perceptions of how their successful partnership developed. These data cluster around five identifiable themes: the process of establishing ownership, the role of the pilot cohort, trust and communication, simultaneous renewal, and the culture of the school.

Establishing Ownership

Teachers describe Ray Sugai as the visionary, a strong and trusted leader who enthusiastically communicated his belief in the value of the partnership. Initially, however, Sugai realized that a partnership commitment would impact the entire school, "from scheduling to parking spaces." According to Sugai, the decision to open up the school to the university could not be "ram-rodged" by a couple of people, but would need buy-in time for teachers. Meetings were held with school and university personnel to discuss the program, agree on roles and responsibilities, and acknowledge that getting involved would be a learning experience for everyone—teachers, administrators, and university faculty alike. Sugai wanted to have as much information as possible available to his staff and to be up front about the demands that this new arrangement would have on the teachers. Larrow reported that all voices were valued, and everyone was encouraged to make an impact on shaping the program. "This is how we govern ourselves, by consensus," Sugai explained. "We had to decide as a school if we should make this commitment and whether or not we would be able to follow through." In the end, the whole school agreed to enter into the new partnership arrangement, and teachers were allowed to decide individually whether or not they would mentor a student teacher.

The Role of the Pilot

The pilot cohort allowed the partnership, in Joe Zilliox' words, to "start small, just to get our feet wet." From the beginning, the presence of 12 cohort students on campus made a positive impression on children and staff members. Teachers and administrators saw the adult to child ratio cut from about 1:30 to 2:30. While this was a significant improvement, the ratio was cut even more, in certain classes, when UH students grouped together to do special projects.

Of course, the pilot cohort was not free of challenges. Some students needed more support than others. They represented a wide range in ability and maturity. "But because our philosophy is 'every child is special, every child can learn,'" said Nagaji, "we transferred it to the cohort as well." When some teachers expressed doubt at their ability to provide the level of expertise needed to mentor a student, school administrators and UH faculty were able to reassure them and explain that what students needed most was the opportunity to work alongside successful teachers. "What won us over," Nagaji recalled, "was the impact the cohort had on the children." These experiences during the pilot semester helped reinforce the school's belief in the value of the partnership.

Trust and Communication

When asked about the attributes of a strong partnership, nearly all the teachers, faculty, and school administrators mentioned the importance of trusting relationships and good communication. Kathy Nagaji added a new role to her job as the school curriculum coordinator, by taking responsibility as the liaison between the university and the school. Everyone agreed that she played a vital role in disseminating information, dealing sensitively and quickly with issues or questions, and nurturing a climate of mutual trust. Sugai commented, "I know we wouldn't have been as successful if we didn't have Kathy in that position." Her frequent meetings, both scheduled and informal, with university personnel, teachers, and cohort students provided a common point of reference for everyone involved. Nagaji felt it was critical to the success of the program for her to stay in touch with the "heartbeat of the school," and she tried to be accessible to the teachers. "I have to be right out there in their rooms asking 'How's it going?' instead of waiting for them to come to me with their concerns or celebrations."

Basic to the trust that Nagaji nurtured with the teachers were the many personal friendships already in place before the partnership began. Nagaji commented that the school staff trusted the university faculty to deal with whatever came up, no matter how trivial the concern. "This trust was further enhanced as university faculty did not hesitate to join in with activities going on at the school. Whatever apprehen-

sions teachers had about university professors observing in their classroom were diminished as Joe [Zilliox] came in to help with math lessons or William [Greene] did storytelling with their classes...our university partners 'walked the talk.'"

Developing effective communications and trustful relationships with student teachers was viewed by mentor teachers as a vital part of their job. They used a number of strategies which included the use of verbal and written reflections, dialogue journals, debriefings through evening phone conversations (especially when school activities prohibited one-on-one discussions during the day), listening intently and attentively to learn about the needs of the student, and being clear about expectations and feelings. Teachers placed a high value on establishing and maintaining open and trustful communication with their students. For example, in communicating to her cohort students, Gloria Shoda made a conscious effort to "find the words, no matter how difficult the situation, to speak about things that are important to bring up."

Simultaneous Renewal

Everyone in the study had examples of how the partnership fostered professional growth, and at the same time, benefitted the preparation of pre-service teachers in the cohorts. The presence of university faculty on campus provided teachers with opportunities to enroll in on-site courses in language arts, health, and math education. Wendy Larrow recalled how her action research project, conducted as a student teacher, was a bridge to her on-going professional development. Later, as a mentor teacher, she realized that her education did not stop with a degree and certification but that "action research became my vehicle for reflecting and evaluating my classroom on a daily basis and for looking at the larger picture of education in a democratic society."

Teachers found that their confidence in their ability to mentor increased through practice. Student teachers introduced them to current research-based strategies and new-paradigm approaches to instruction in math, reading, and writing. Many were similar to strategies the school was already trying to adopt, but as Kathy Nagaji observed, "it's so much easier, after seeing the cohort students try it in the classroom and watching the children's response, to try it out by yourself." Teachers were also able to implement new ideas with a student as a partner. Of course, this teamwork required time to plan. Gloria Shoda remarked that she tried to learn many of the new things that her student teacher wanted to try out, such as reading and writing workshops.

To do this, we conferenced, planned, and reflected about our students' needs and what these in-class workshops would look like. These experiences as a mentor caused me to examine and re-examine what I believed to be true and to challenge myself – to hold my beliefs about teaching, about

children, and about teaching children up close for scrutiny and to examine whether I do what I say I believe. The willingness of the student teachers to attend and support extracurricular school activities also had an impact, not only on teachers, but on parents as well.

Confidence in the program and partnership brought a number of unforeseen benefits. It had the effect of “opening up the classrooms,” as the principal, Ray Sugai, observed. There was an increase in the number and variety of adults coming and going, working with the children, and exchanging ideas.

Culture of the School

Philosophically, the school was predisposed toward an inclusive educational environment. In Joe Zilliox’ view, this environment provided a common language and grounding for the partnership and that a common set of values were more easily established and a feeling of mutual respect created that permeated all aspects of the school’s cultural milieu. Nearly all respondents mentioned that as a TRIBES trained school, Pearl Ridge staff and students knew how to honor their relationships with each other. Strategies fostering mutual respect became part of a common language and common goal that helped nurture a partner relationship with the university. Cohort students were treated as members of the Pearl Ridge faculty rather than as guests, and this introduced them as contributing members of the school community.

There was a structure and a vision already in place for having ‘outside’ people become part of the school. Because of that structure, the involvement with the pre-service program was not seen as a major disruption with the operation or orientation at the school.

The school even made special arrangements for cohort students to participate in staff in-services and workshops. For example, Pearl Ridge funded and hosted a four-day TRIBES training for two groups of cohort students with the conviction that the training would contribute significantly to their work at Pearl Ridge and their future in the classroom. As a result of this “invitational” approach, cohort students responded and grew in positive ways. They were part of something much bigger than a traditional, solitary classroom experience could have provided; they were part of an entire school community.

Learning New Roles

As individuals shared perspectives on their roles within the partnership, it became clear that this model compelled them to adapt to some new beliefs and expectations.



l-r Randy Hitz, Art King, Joe Zilliox, June Uyehara, Judith Hughes, Tom Stone and Joy Marsella

Principal

Early on, Ray Sugai had become aware of the larger network of educational renewal in the state and across the country through his involvement as an associate with the Hawai’i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HIEP). As a result, he viewed his role as a partner school principal as an important agent in promoting the professional education of his staff and supporting educational reform. He knew that it would require a whole-school “investment” to be effective. He aimed to give his staff a thorough sense of how partnerships could benefit the educational system. He also shared his ideas with new groups of cohort students as they began their field experience at Pearl Ridge. He spoke about the culture of the school, its interdependent parts, and how everyone who set foot on the campus shared in and had an impact on that culture. One university faculty member commented that this was a liberating idea, an open invitation to be a part of the school. Sugai acknowledged that principals who have not had a chance to assess the partnership idea or witnessed the benefits that accrues to the school and faculty may be reluctant to take on this kind of change. He suggested that an orientation presentation to prospective partnership principals may be of some use, but people need to be open to it and somehow see the value before they can be expected to commit to it.

Curriculum Coordinator

Kathy Nagaji’s role as curriculum coordinator existed before the partnership began. Her broadly-defined job description involved “supporting teachers in whatever new program we are undertaking.” The extensive list of her responsibilities includes included work with the Success Compact Literacy program, drama and First Steps Writing (both grant related), teaching media literacy in classrooms, teaching video



Wendy Lum and students

production with grades 4-6, grant writing, and creating a tutoring program using parents, staff, and community volunteers. When Pearl Ridge adopted the partnership, Kathy's role as liaison was "squished" in with other responsibilities. The key element to learning this new role was making time to talk to the teachers, to keep in touch with what they were experiencing in the classroom. This included a lot of listening, brainstorming, and "passing on" of information to the university coordinator.

A university faculty member noted that "Kathy heard many of the teachers' concerns before they reached me. We stayed in close touch through drop-in visits on campus, e-mail, and phone conversations. When concerns surfaced, we tried to see issues from both mentor and student perspectives and discussed what, if any, action to take." Many of her interactions with teachers occurred after school or on the phone at home. She wanted teachers to know their voice was valued and would be taken seriously. Dealing effectively with conflict was another aspect of her new role. Handling conflict entails a willingness to listen patiently and a capacity to seek possible solutions. The most challenging conflicts stemmed from unwillingness to see beyond certain limited perceptions. Classrooms with two adults can add to the strain of work. Other challenges emerged as decisions had to be made whether to continue the partnership of student and teacher, or make a new placement. Fortunately, "only one situation demanded this drastic measure as the rest of the conflicts were resolved through intervention and mediation with the UH faculty."

Mentor Teachers

Mentor teachers tended to describe their roles in different terms than would be expected from teachers in strictly supervisory roles. All of the teachers questioned in this survey emphasized the need to nurture supportive, trusting

relationships. Several extended the use of their TRIBES strategies to the mentor-student relationship. For instance, collaboration, working as colleagues, trust, emotional safety, inclusion, and open communication were concepts that loomed largely in their statements regarding their role as mentors. Wendy Lum commented that "we were challenged to help them find the space to grow roots into the field of good teaching practices and acquire the confidence to develop their own personal style." Wendy Larrow recalled that much of her efforts reflected the kind of mentoring she had received as a student teacher and that learning together as a team was a valued part of the mentor-student relationship. Part of the roles learned by mentor teachers involved openness to personal growth and change as well as the challenge to bring to the task all of their knowledge and experience in working with others. Gloria Shoda described in detail how this process worked for her:

"Each pre-service student that I work with is unique in personality, in attitude, in strength, and in needs. Each time I choose to work as closely as I do with them, my best practical understanding of how to make a relationship work is called up for real practice and application. My school has invested and served me with tools so that I can be as successful as possible with relationships. I know TRIBE strategies, collegial coaching skills, conflict mediation strategies, and breathe the full inclusion philosophy. I have an understanding of what works best in order to be collaborative. The relationship as partners teaching side-by-side on the floor is one that is to be nurtured so that seeds may be sown, so that successful practices in the craft of teaching can be passed on from one generation of teachers to the next. Students have their own style. I need to be flexible enough to allow them time to develop things their way. When I try things that my pre-service teachers want to try, I invite them to join me in doing things that I believe are important for them to do, like presenting to parents, fellow students, and teachers at faculty or district math conferences. If we work together at things that have value but are difficult and uncomfortable, we will get better at it – like rope jumping, playing jacks, or riding a bicycle for the very first time. I want my partners to be able to recognize those feelings of anxiety before they take risks and when they stretch themselves. I want them to feel confident that not all of their questions need to be answered before they begin but that they will find answers to their questions as they journey on that risk-taking road. The floor that we share in the classroom is where my partner will gain confidence. And as confidences and relationships successfully develop, my confidence in my own ability to be a mentor is strengthened."

Mentors also grew into new roles as leaders, both within and outside of the school. Nancy Morikawa conducted TRIBES training for two cohort groups, participated as an

associate with the (HIEP), and served on a panel about stewardship. Through her experiences, she realized “my desire to give back to the profession that I have the greatest respect for.”

College Faculty

College faculty roles adapted to fit the learning curve and struggles of the partnership process. These roles needed to be supportive and to integrate seamlessly into the culture of the school. At the same time, staff needed to view the university coordinators as collegial participants who were learning along with them. The professors didn’t have all the answers. Indeed, it was important that they searched for answers together with the teachers. Constant communication helped to prevent concerns from festering, and there was a certain value to maintaining a casual and frequent presence on campus. Part of the renewal of university faculty involved coming to terms with what constructivist teaching would look like in a teacher preparation program. How were they to apply and model some of the same principles of constructivism to student teachers that the students were learning as an approach to their own teaching? This approach to the field experiences of the students also presented some challenges when questions arose such as, “What should cohorts be doing and when should they be doing it?”

Teachers were encouraged to provide a scaffold so that the students could gradually widen their circle of responsibilities and experiences. At times, even some of the most experienced and capable teachers expressed doubt in their ability to provide appropriate levels of assistance. This approach placed a lot of trust in the unique contributions of the individual mentor, and university faculty tried to recognize and acknowledge the many different and creative ways that teachers employed to rise to this challenge.

Challenges

Generally, according to Ray Sugai, the partnership relationships developed “fairly smoothly,” though there were probably more individual challenges than programmatic ones. This observation echoed others’ responses. The philosophical compatibility that had emerged between the university teacher education program and Pearl Ridge was established early in their relationship and care had been taken to work through differences collaboratively. But at the level of individual teachers and student teachers, differences in personality, style, and philosophy emerged as the process of building relationships progressed. Two recurrent themes stand out in the comments: “getting along” and “making teaching public.”



“College methods courses, taught on-site, provide a forum where faculty interact regularly with classroom teachers and K-12 students” page 5

Getting Along

According to Kathy Nagaji and others, probably the greatest fear of the teachers is, “What if I don’t get along with my cohort student?” These situations usually fell into the category of philosophical differences. Ray Sugai remarked that some of the teachers had to confront the old versus the new paradigm in teacher training. “They had to be more constructivist instead of having a check list of requirements to follow,” he said. Trying to accept and work with reasonable differences was a necessary part of moving ahead in the partnership. Kathy Nagaji and the university coordinators worked together to match mentors and cohorts each semester. A number of variables were considered, including individual style and personality. Even with these considerations, the reality is that conflicts will still arise. These may be due to personalities, different expectations or perspectives, and even challenges to authority. Such differences underscored teachers’ awareness of the importance of communication, teacher standards, documented agreements and timelines, the necessity of building relationships, and accepting diversity. Nancy Morikawa said in reference to a small number of students passing through the cohort program may not become teachers:

“But we still need to give them the best teacher training possible. Equally important is the need to share with them our lives and to model and guide them toward maturing into caring individuals who can contribute positively in some way to the future of our society.”

Making Teaching Public

Gloria Shoda remarked insightfully at the end of a mentor-faculty-student three-way conference: “I can’t tell you how hard it is to make our teaching public.” She was referring to the difficult task that accomplished teachers face of verbalizing their wisdom of practice. Wendy Lum refers to this as

“thinking aloud as a mentor.” It is an important part of mentoring as it helps the cohort student to grasp the multifaceted perspectives that go into the decisions that teachers make. Thinking aloud demands that teachers be reflective about their teaching which in turn requires time to question, analyze, and discuss. One of the common frustrations among teachers and cohort students was not having time available each day for this kind of conversation. Ray Sugai and Kathy Nagaji were responsive to this need in a two ways. Teachers were released from recess duty 30 minutes per week to allow a small, but significant, time to dialogue with their student teachers. Kathy Nagaji was also able to juggle schedules and shift responsibilities without adding costs to the budget. In addition, Ray Sugai rescheduled staff meetings to allow mentors and students time to meet together every fourth Wednesday.

Conclusion

The bonds and relationships created among school and UH faculty were a key factor in the Pearl Ridge decision to continue as a partner site. The staff felt supported by its university partner, particularly because “we were listened to and actions were taken promptly.” As one of the teachers observed “a partnership that lacks this level of responsiveness, can quickly go downhill.” Both Ray Sugai and Kathy Nagaji, however, agree strongly that more support for mentor teachers at the institutional level is needed.

“Although none of our teachers participated in the partnership for any reason other than investing in the future and providing for the present, the reality is that teachers are professionals and need to be compensated for sharing their wealth of expertise and precious time.” He also added that while every school doesn’t have a curriculum coordinator position, the role is vitally important in the success of the partnership, and the funding of such a position between the Department of Education and the College of Education should be considered.

Currently, Pearl Ridge is taking a year off to allow time for staff to reflect, assess, and re-focus before mentoring a new cohort next fall. “We want to make sure we’re not burning anybody out.”

All of those contributing to the text of this article expressed overwhelming agreement on the positive value of the partnership to the children, to the school community, and to themselves. Speaking of the accomplishments of the program in training teachers, Kathy Nagaji remarked, “We look for every opportunity to hire them back.” There may be no stronger statement of the enduring potential of school-university partnerships.



Kathy Nakagi, Gloria Shoda, Wendy Lum, Nancy Morikawa and Ray Sugai in front of a mural painted by children of Pearl Ridge Elementary School

William Greene is an assistant professor in the department of education at Southern Oregon University. He taught in the elementary cohort program at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa from 1995 to 1998.

Kathy Nagaji is curriculum coordinator at Pearl Ridge Elementary School in central Oahu.

Ray Sugai has been principal at Pearl Ridge Elementary School for the past ten years. In addition to leading two schools to National Blue Ribbon awards, he received the National Distinguished Principal Award in 1995 and the Miken Award for Education in 1996.

Gloria Shoda is a third grade teacher at Pearl Ridge Elementary School. In addition to her 30 years of experience, Gloria was a Presidential Awardee for Excellence in Science and Mathematics Teaching.

Nancy Morikawa has spent 27 years teaching at Pearl Ridge Elementary School.

Wendy Lum teaches fifth grade at Pearl Ridge Elementary School.

Partnerships for Simultaneous Renewal: A Progress Report

Richard W Clark

Five constructs are useful in examining the status of school-university partnerships nationally and in Hawai'i: *perspective, purpose, participants, process and performance*. They serve as organizers for generalizations I first developed in 1998 based on 13 years of working with similar partnerships and on my comprehensive review of the literature on university, school, community partnerships commissioned by the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence, George Washington University.¹

But before I proceed with my discussion and provide more details of these themes and their application to the situation in Hawai'i, a caveat is needed. I have been following the work of the Hawai'i partnership ever since I conducted the site review in 1985, on which the decision to admit the Hawai'i partnership to the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) was based. In spite of this long connection, the comments that follow suffer from gaps in understanding that are inevitable when one's information is based on one or two visits to the state each year, rather than a continuous immersion in the setting. In colloquial terms, I may know just enough to be dangerous.

The following identifies some generalizations regarding partnerships focused on simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education throughout the country. Completing the discussion, where appropriate, are some observations that relate to Hawai'i's experiences.

Perspective

In an early review of the literature on school-university partnerships² I noted, as others had, that while shared experiences should unite educators who work in these settings, there is really a considerable gap between the culture of the two kinds of institutions. At the time, I believed that this gap was largely one of misunderstanding, of lack of knowledge of what each other is doing. However, the problem appears to be more than that. The perspective with which these two groups of educators view each other is most often characterized as follows:

Mistrust appears to be the "natural state" of relationships involving university, school, and community members.

There are various possible sources of this mistrust. In some instances it grows out of prior unsatisfactory relationships—situations in which teachers have felt used by researchers or

researchers have seen a lack of follow through by teachers. In other cases, its origins are traced to tensions created by a teacher-pupil relationship which school people doubt professors will give up to form a peer relationship. In some situations, university people find school people so immersed in the daily life of school that they are unable or unwilling to engage in reflective behavior. Others point to the differences in the culture of schools which value egalitarian relationships and those of universities that promote a more hierarchical set of relationships with their emphasis on competition for individual recognition and promotion. School cultures encourage compliant behavior by teachers while university cultures tend to produce professors who function as individuals rejecting either external direction or participation as team members. Whatever the source of this mistrust, it causes problems as efforts are made to create productive partnerships.

K-12 teachers express their distrust of university professors when they tell student teachers to forget what they have heard on the campus and pay attention to how it is done in the real world. Distrust of K-12 teachers is evident as professors voice concerns that teachers are unaware of the latest research and unable to grasp theoretical or abstract issues.

While my original literature review did not focus on partnerships that involve arts and science and college of education faculty, there is ample evidence of similar mistrust (or, at least, lack of mutual respect) between these groups. (In a sense they also compose two different and hard to reconcile cultures). Goodlad and his colleagues identified "status deprivation" as one of the major problems facing teacher education in the academy.³ More recently, our ongoing discussions with member institutions of the NNER and other institutions of higher education (IHE's), as part of the Well-Educated Teacher Project, has revealed that many faculty blame others for perceived deficiencies in teacher preparation. That is, college of education professors lament the adequacy of content preparation of the students enrolled in their professional courses and arts and science professors complain that education students are the weakest in their classes and are not held to high standards by faculty in the college of education.

From the beginning, and periodically throughout its existence, the Hawai'i partnership has shown evidence of such mistrust or lack of respect among the constituent groups. When we convened a meeting of the Trustees of

Kamehameha, the University Regents and the State Board of Education early in the life of the partnership, there was a glimmer of hope that such a discussion on issues of mutual interest would offer promise for future collaboration. However, that promise has not always been fulfilled. One does not have to spend a long time in the Islands to hear teachers or administrators from the Department of Education (DOE) complain about the failures of the College of Education, or to hear college educators complain about the inadequacies of the K-12 system in the state. Perhaps this conflict reached its height several years ago when the DOE failed to approve certain College of Education programs, a conflict that spilled over into legislative halls where deliberations were under way regarding the funding of university programs.

Generally speaking, extensive dialogue about substantive matters of mutual concern (rather than artificial trust-building activities) and accomplishment of specific goals are the most successful strategies for creating more trusting relationships.

Fortunately, during my most recent visit (September 1999) there were promising signs of increasing cooperation between the agencies. In part, this was attributed to work by a new dean and new superintendent to build a collaborative environment. The question now is whether this top-level communication will result in changes in behavior and attitudes by various school and university educators. I will have more to say about the way other activities may be contributing to this improving climate later—the important thing to note at this point is that there are increasing signs among all the partners of the mutual respect that is the perspective from which a successful partnership effort must grow.

To have lasting, successful partnerships, participants need to be thoroughly grounded in the context for their work.

Participants need to know the history of their partnership and become familiar with relevant experiences within their specific community. They need to build on past successes and use past failures as a guide as to what they should avoid.

The materials regarding their work, that the Hawai'i partnership prepared and presented to the summer 1999 conference *In Praise of Education*, provide useful information about the background efforts in the Islands. The Summer 1990 issue of *Educational Perspectives* and this issue represent other efforts to make sure that the history of the work in Hawai'i is well documented and that the ideas central to it are shared with constituents. The continuing challenge for the partnership is to make such materials broadly available and to encourage critical discussion of them.

Purpose

Partnerships succeed only when participants have the same clear understanding of the collaboration's purpose and function.

During the early years of the NNER, I attended many meetings where superintendents and deans talked at length about the need to have clear goals and mission statements for their partnership. Similar conversations were taking place among early partners in the Holmes Group. What characterized many of these discussions was a "search" for purpose rather than a coming together in recognition of a common purpose. Often it seemed that the most common driving force was a desire to join, to be a part of a high status group.⁴

Fortunately, the work of the NNER has been increasingly purposeful. NNER settings recognize that the demise of initiatives and their replacement by others after promising beginnings is a common norm of educational reform. Goodlad employs a useful image to describe this shortcoming: too often he claims such efforts "fail to put models in the showroom." This condition is in large part the consequence of rather simple agendas, "dumbed down" so as not to scare off participants. In contrast, the purposes of the NNER settings are set forth in an Agenda for Education in a Democracy. John Goodlad reminds us that this agenda is "complex, comprehensive, and seemingly inexhaustible with respect to implications and possibilities for implementation. It is very high, rather than low, in expectations, particularly for the intellect. The Agenda invites inquiry and provides readings designed to enlighten that inquiry: into what education is, the meaning of democracy and democratic character, the public purpose of schooling, issues of access to education, the nature of knowledge, the moral stewardship of schools, caring pedagogy, and more. And the Agenda speaks to the practical conditions that must be put in place if schools and teacher education programs are to be robust and renewing."⁵

The agenda envisions a four-part mission for schools and teacher education: enculturating the young in a social and political democracy, ensuring access to knowledge for children and youths in the schools, developing a caring pedagogy, and promoting the moral stewardship of schools for students in teacher education programs.

The basic strategy by which settings in the NNER implement this agenda is through the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education.

As participants become engaged in renewal activities they begin to translate their work into shared directions. Progress is achieved through the design of new teacher education programs: the creation of professional development schools; the improvement of school programs, such as reading or math instruction; the improvement of principal preparation

programs; or the development of some other facet of education that helps participants realize that they can accomplish more by working together than they can by working independently.

The national pattern has been evident in Hawai'i. Early task force activity often seemed to be taken up with a search for purpose rather than the accomplishment of particular ends. However, some of the task forces began to produce results: new teacher education programs were designed, the principal preparation program was reinvented, and professional development schools were created. As these changes evolved a growing number of participants began to see the potential in collaborative work. Still, relatively few people were directly involved in partnership activities and non-participants seemed to see the partnership as either irrelevant or as a threat. That part of the DOE not initially involved (particularly those on the islands other than O'ahu) worried that those who were part of the partnership would gain through unfair distribution of resources. Some professors in the College of Education preferred to pursue familiar patterns of research and teaching practices rather than collaborating on new ventures with new partners who possessed a different set of interests. Often university faculty in Hawaii, as elsewhere, perceive that their personal rewards (financial and intellectual) will come from productivity as researchers, not from clinical work. They see partnership work as adding to their responsibilities – a form of work, moreover, that they perceive not to be valued by the university. However, for some the issue of rewards for the partnership work may be more an excuse to avoid something they do not value. In other situations, it is clear that there are real impediments to partnership work built into the higher education system. In any event, it provides evidence that for some of the participants there really is not a clear, common purpose.

Watching such partnerships throughout the country, it has become evident that clarity of purpose is best achieved by extended conversations among the participants and by engagement in a multitude of specific projects, not by formal agreements drafted by a few and passively accepted by others.

The literature provides the basis for a second generalization regarding purpose and partnerships.

A partnership that has as its purpose the creation of a partnership—rather than the accomplishment of some ultimate goal—is inevitably doomed to early failure.

Of course, partnerships do not declare survival as their mission, they simply behave as if their continuing reason for existence is the maintenance of their organization. For example, this is the case when partnerships devote inordinate

amounts of time to discussions of by-laws, to debate regarding conditions for membership, to planning of “annual” meetings, or to revising mission statements.

While not having avoided all such problems, the Hawaii School University Partnership (HSUP) now the Hawai'i Institute for Educational Partnerships (HEIP) appears to be clearer about its purpose and less preoccupied by survival than many other partnerships. This is particularly true as participants focus on local issues. While the NNER may provide an overarching agenda for the partnership, the local circumstances must drive the actual work of the partnership as it pursues its own version of that agenda.

The following generalizations regarding participants in partnerships are important because the individuals in a partnership will determine whether it is able to accomplish its purposes even if these purposes have been clarified.

Participants

Getting the right people to participate to accomplish the purpose of the partnership is critical.

It is important to obtain general, institutional support for participation. This is evident in the instance of the strong institutional support for the partnership by both Brigham Young University and the districts surrounding it. Because of this support, that partnership has been able to involve several hundred professors, teachers, and administrators in leadership associate programs. Similarly, deep commitment by university presidents such as Diane Natalicio at the University of Texas at El Paso and Richard Pattenau at the University of Southern Maine has made it possible for those settings to develop exemplary partnerships that have broad participation.

Initially, the Hawai'i partnership had the requisite institutional support as a result of commitments from leaders in the DOE, the College of Education, and Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estate. These early commitments helped draw others into the partnership work. However, in Hawaii the original engagement of administrators and teachers from Kamehameha deteriorated, then ended, as the Board changed and withdrew support for such activities by the school. Early participation by the College of Education dean and the DOE superintendent persisted after they were replaced, but not with the enthusiasm or depth of commitment that the founders had shown, nor with the enthusiasm current leaders display. Fortunately, the new leadership has brought a new impetus and new partners into the partnership. Support from four arts and science deans is leading to increased participation from that part of the university and involvement from CRDG has added another element.

However, it is not simply a question of general institutional support. The Partnership needs to support the right people to perform various tasks. For example, if high-powered administrators are brought together to accomplish a technical task, it is unlikely to be accomplished. Similarly, there are apt to be problems if technical people are asked to accomplish tasks such as establishing the mission of the partnership or identifying needed policy actions. However, while technical specialists are needed for a complex technical task, these technical experts will fail if there is not significant support from the top leadership of the participating organizations. More explicitly, engaging such "technical workers" as school-based educators without sufficient support from the district administration or professors without support from the departments and colleges from which they come, will only work if the task is quite limited and of short duration.

For complex work requiring sustained effort, strong institutional support is needed, but partnerships have special needs at the beginning, thus the following generalization.

Boundary spanners or intermediate engineers are necessary to facilitate communication across the culture of different participating groups.

In partnerships composed of university, school, and community groups, boundary spanners must know and be accepted in each arena. Likely candidates are school-based educators who have actively engaged with civic organizations and worked in adjunct capacities on college campuses or university people who have worked closely with schools and been active in civic endeavors.

The members of the NNER have tested various arrangements for providing these boundary spanners. In some instances, an attempt has been made to assign this role as an added duty to a university professor or administrator with or without release from other responsibilities. Retired educators from either schools or the university have been used on a part or full time basis. By far the most success so far in securing external funds and in building effective communication links among the partners has come from development of a full time secretariat supported by adequate clerical assistance. Recently several partnerships, including Hawai'i, have developed offices to obtain boundary spanning by having a leadership group that consists of representatives from the various component groups. While this latter approach is promising, there has not been enough experience with it to assess what it can accomplish.

Hawai'i has employed several of the approaches used elsewhere. Its first executive director, Fred Elliston, was a full time professor who was released from a part of his job to perform the role. Unfortunately, he was killed in an accident before he was really able to establish himself in the position.

Next, Juvenna Chang came from an administrative position at Kamehameha as the second director. Her broad contacts in the DOE and knowledge of her own institution helped her engage all the different groups in the work of the Partnership. As a doctoral student in the college of education, she had the advantage of frequent contact with University faculty and, at times, the disadvantage of being seen as a student rather than a peer. Ann Port, a former DOE personnel administrator, and Phil Whitsell, a former associate dean in the College of Education took on the leadership task next. As a team, each of them had deep familiarity with the institution from which they came. As individuals, each had to build relations with the component of the Partnership that was new. To some degree, their success in gaining a broad understanding of the needs of all participants led naturally to the current move to have a representative from the College of Education, the DOE, Arts and Sciences and CRDG. The new quartet will have its success measured in part by the extent to which each comes to learn the other cultures and develops projects that are of mutual value to all partners. If each simply is a part-time person working with an unlinked project, it is unlikely that there will be the collaboration needed for benefits to accrue from the Partnership.

As the next generalization suggests, partnerships need more than leaders.

A sufficient mass of individual participants must be developed who are thoroughly familiar with the agenda of the partnership in order to (1) achieve the goals and (2) sustain the work in the face of the inevitable turnovers in key positions.

This means that a complex partnership must have a training strategy and the resources to implement it. Nationally, 150 educators have participated in the NNER Leadership Associate Program. Professors from colleges of education, and colleges of arts and science, and teachers and administrators from school districts, who have taken part in this program, have developed a common language, common understanding of underlying principles and developed skills necessary to making progress on the Agenda. The graduates of this national program have taken leadership in providing associate programs for more than 1,200 educators in NNER settings.

The Hawai'i partnership drew inspiration from this work and developed its own version of the program. The Hawai'i Leadership Associate Program (HLAP) has advanced the understanding of partnership work among professional educators with three cohorts involving 60 some educators.

The national leadership associates program has been supported by three foundations, one of which also provided much of the funding that enabled NNER settings including Hawai'i to initiate their programs. While funding continues

for the national program, many local settings, including Hawaii, are without means of funding for their programs. Local settings need to find support for their associate programs or similar initiatives, if they are to keep their partnerships vital and avoid the problems that may lead to the demise of the partnership. (See stage “6” as described below).

Besides finding and training the right participants, partnerships need to attend to the processes by which they seek to accomplish their mission.

Process

Clearly understood purpose and function must be supported by the right structure (meaning the right group and individual membership and organizational arrangements) and adequate support mechanisms (meaning governance arrangements and funding).

As a result of their study of teacher education, Goodlad and colleagues developed a list of conditions necessary for robust teacher education programs.⁶ They include: institutional commitment and support, continuous recruitment of promising candidates, a unified faculty representing all of the major programmatic components, a solid general education program for all candidates, the connecting of theory and practice, internships in renewing schools, and evaluation and renewal as an ongoing process. Moreover, they determined that there are three major components of a successful teacher education enterprise.

First, there must be exemplary “teaching” schools (commonly referred to as professional development or partner schools), just as there are exemplary “teaching” hospitals for medical education. Second, the teachers of our children and youths must be well-educated citizens. Third, there must be immersion in specialized studies that connect the future teacher with the subject matter of her or his calling and the mastery of techniques that facilitate the learning of others.

Under usual conditions these three major components are separately under the control of three groups of actors who rarely plan together, rarely converse together about each other’s domain, rarely are identified as commonly accountable, and share no common mission. The remedies are as obvious as the debility: the three groups of individuals responsible for the parts—in the schools where future teachers practice as students, in the arts and sciences departments, and in the colleges of education—must come together as a single, responsible faculty. Goodlad refers to such a faculty as a “center of pedagogy.”⁷

However the creation of a “center of pedagogy,” or the creation of general school-university partnerships, or the establishment of a professional development school, no

matter how desirable, is not something easily done. One reason is that the three groups inhabit different cultures. Another is that the tradition of separate responsibility for different segments of the educational enterprise is very hard to dissolve.

The legislation originally introduced in the Hawai’i legislature that led to the creation of the HIEP had the creation of a center of pedagogy as its aim. The present version of the Institute has emerged from debate over its role in relation to the existing partnership and the various components of the college of education. The new HIEP may be able to provide the necessary coordination, but it does not represent the creation of a common faculty for teacher education.

Hawaii has joined several of the other partnerships in the NNER such as BYU and Wyoming in welcoming leadership from arts and science on the governing board of the partnership. Also, as in Nebraska, BYU, Wyoming and elsewhere, the nature of the educational system in Hawaii assures the inclusion of the state in the governance of the Partnership. Such provisions provide a good starting point for building a structure that will be able to make significant changes.

In Hawai’i, the recent designation of four persons to provide leadership to the HIEP offers the promise of building a new structure along the lines that Goodlad recommends. Providing each of these directors, with half time responsibility to the partnership, should help obtain sufficient participation from the schools, arts and science, the college of education, and the CRDG. In an interesting development, the arts and science representative, Joy Marcella, has taken what appears to be a useful next step by creating an advisory group to work with her from each of the component A&S colleges. The other three directors might employ this strategy constructively with their constituents. However, each director in working with such advisory constituent groups will have to keep in mind the importance of using such groups to build support for common goals, as well as for identifying work of interest to the group.

Assuming that these professionals are provided with the clerical/administrative support that they need, this arrangement may well be a model for others in the nation to emulate. While the structure is commendable, the real test will come in the performance of the group. If these key players are able to tackle necessary tasks and to generate grants to help pay for the work, then it is likely the partnership will continue to grow in importance.

Individuals engaged in partnership activities must be engaged in authentic ways.

Token participation by any segment of the population is likely to backfire on organizers of a partnership. Partnership

efforts to involve arts and science faculty have too often bogged down in talking about what a good idea such involvement is rather than getting on with real work. School participants in teacher education discussions have sometimes been marginalized when it comes time for decisions regarding programs because they are not “voting members” of the faculty. University faculty members have been welcomed in a school as long as they did not become critical of the way the school was being conducted. More than one partnership has realized that it is having trouble because some key group—school principals, superintendent, or university administration—was either left out or included in token ways. These are not necessary conditions. For example, at the University of Southern Maine, teachers based in schools have been voting on important university faculty decisions, university faculty are seen as participants in the daily life of school renewal, and arts and science faculty co-teach classes with college of education faculty in the new TEAMS undergraduate teacher preparation program. Similar instances of involvement exist in many of the NNER partnerships.

In Hawai‘i, the Masters of Education in Teaching (MET) program is led by an executive council that includes teachers, students, principals, and faculty who meet monthly to consider practical issues and make decisions. For years, authentic participation by students, school and university faculty have been evident in such partner schools as Salt Lake, Ala Wai, Castle, Dole Intermediate and Kailua High School in Hawai‘i. As other partner schools have come on line, particularly in the elementary teacher education program, similar signs of collaborative behavior have emerged. Some arts and science faculty have played important roles in developing school programs in areas such as writing, geography, and philosophy. Many faculty from both arts and science and the college of education were key collaborators with school educators in developing the new curriculum standards approved in the state. Some progress was made in building relationships through the Hawai‘i Leadership Associates program; however, not all engagement of arts and science and college of education faculty in work with schools is viewed positively. Continuation and expansion of the kinds of work that reflect authentic engagement will have much influence on the future success of the HIEP.

Performance

Partnerships progress through stages of development.

At the end of the first five years of the NNER, Carol Wilson, Paul Heckman, and I posited the existence of five stages in the life of a partnership. In my most recent discussion of those stages I added a sixth.⁸ No partnership that I

have witnessed passes through these stages in nice, neat, linear fashion. Rather, movement occurs forward, then back (maybe even slipping several steps back) then lurches forward. The stages are,

- 1 Getting Organized
- 2 Early Success
- 3 Waiting for Results
- 4 Major Success and Expansions
- 5 Mature Partnership
- 6 The Death of the Partnership

Several authors have found the original description of these stages helpful in analyzing their own partnerships.⁹ One clear lesson from thinking about the development of partnerships from this perspective is that to avoid getting hung up at the first stage, participants need to avoid celebrating victory too soon. Early success should be built on, not dwelled on. Invitations to tell others of the progress being made by the partnership must be accepted on only a limited basis or the leadership of the partnership will find too much of its energy being diverted from the critical early work. In creating and supporting the NNER, John Goodlad and his colleagues have deliberately avoided these early claims, but now believe it is possible to find examples of mature implementation of the various parts of an Agenda for Education in a Democracy by observing what is happening in the various members of the network.¹⁰

Some have been troubled by the addition of the sixth stage. Is death really inevitable? Possibly not. However, two of the four partnerships we originally identified as having reached maturity when we started this list in 1989, are now dead. Fortunately for those concerned with renewal, there are signs at both of those places of the birth of new endeavors where the influence of the earlier partnership efforts can be seen. Maybe reincarnation is a seventh stage that needs to be added.¹¹

Some might suggest that the HIEP represents such a seventh stage for the partnership in Hawai‘i. Because of its origins in legislative proposals promoted by the HSUP, and because of the continuity of efforts such as the further development of partner schools, it seems more like an instance of considering results from earlier efforts and using them to strengthen and expand the work of the existing partnership.

Partnerships that move beyond the initial stages tend to have effective mechanisms for evaluating their progress and use these evaluations to help them make corrections.

Often an outside agent or critical friend plays an important role in assisting with such formative evaluations. The

Southern Maine Partnership has used a variety of such external evaluators. They have obtained critical assistance from the Montclair partnership. They have opened up their professional development schools to so much scrutiny that case studies about them are among the most reported in all the literature on such schools. They have engaged in examining their work with NCTAF, NCATE, and the Atlas project. Such continuing critical examination has been helpful in maintaining their status as one of the most often cited partnerships in the country.

The University of Texas at El Paso (UTEP) has created another exemplary partnership. In part because UTEP has been successful in obtaining outside funding from private foundations, federal agencies, and the State of Texas, they have also engaged in substantial evaluation of their work. A longitudinal study of their work, funded by The Pew Charitable Trusts, revealed that they were among the most successful of similar initiatives funded by this foundation. The state supported evaluation of professional development schools, while not as comprehensive as originally envisioned, was also positive. Meanwhile, these same schools have been reporting gains in student performance on the new state standards exams. Such positive evaluations have helped the partnerships maintain momentum; they have also helped them to obtain added financial support.

Policy makers and potential funding agencies often want unambiguous information about the accomplishment of partnerships, but such information is difficult to provide. Probably the most convincing data that are now available reveal that professional development schools produce teachers that are considered by the preparing institutions and the school districts that hire them to be superior. There are few instances of evaluation with useful information one way or the other about the performance of K-12 students as a result of partnership efforts. Many variables intervene between the actions of partnerships and the eventual performance of elementary and high school students. Because of these difficulties, participants in partnerships need to guard against making promises that can't be measured as they seek support for their work.

In Hawai'i, the partnership directors have conducted several surveys seeking information on how participants perceive the partnership. They have also provided periodic summaries of accomplishment for use by the governing board and by constituents of the partnership. Several issues of this journal have focused on the work of the partnership providing another source of information for reflection on its work. Current efforts by the University of Hawai'i to obtain NCATE approval should lead to more thorough program evaluation. Also, some of the Hawaii schools have shown an interest in pilot work under way by NCATE regarding standards for PDS's.

Conclusion

Nationally, there are some solid reasons for believing that what has been accomplished to date will not be just one more casualty along the road to the redesign of teacher education. Several major ones come to mind:

- Teacher education has moved from obscurity to the front burner as a determinant of school quality.
- There is considerable agreement among researchers and national committees on the major conditions necessary to create robust, renewing teacher education programs.
- Recent federal acts are providing financial resources for the establishment of the school-university partnerships now seen as a cornerstone of such programs.
- Collectively, the settings of the NNER are now a decade down the road in both substance and process in seeking to establish the conditions around which agreement is rapidly growing. Consequently, there exists a diverse laboratory of NNER settings from which to draw lessons and directions for improvement that apply to a very wide range of institutional characteristics.

Hawai'i appears to be a partnership that fluctuates between stage 5 and stage 3—between maturity and the expectation of results. Evidence of progress is mixed with signs of work to be done:

- Teacher education programs have been redefined with considerable success—although the shape of the program for preparing secondary teachers continues to be a matter of debate.
- Professional development schools have been created—although many are at the very early stage of their development and much work will be required to establish them as examples of mature partnership.
- The newly created HIEP has an ambitious agenda, a capable staff and is governed by key decision makers—yet it needs clarification of the financial support it will receive and the professional staff need clerical/administrative support.
- The state has adopted new standards for its K-12 curriculum, standards that were developed with considerable input from arts and science, college of education and school-based educators. The Hawai'i Teachers' Standards Board has also adopted reforms. However, the work of linking both these sets of standards effectively with general education at the University and with teacher preparation has just begun.

- The newly formed policy center within the HIEP offers promise as a source of research-based data for decision making concerning education in the Islands—the next step for this center is producing results that will provide it with credibility, causing funding sources to provide needed resources.
- The writing project, the Hawai'i Leadership Associates Program, and other collaborative efforts involving the University of Hawai'i and the Department of Education have produced a reservoir of talent from which the leaders of the HIEP need to draw in future activities. Too often project leaders forget that these people are available.

Endnotes

- 1 Other versions of these generalizations have appeared in several places. See Richard W Clark, "School-University Partnerships and Professional Development Schools," *Peabody Journal of Education* 74 (1999):164-177. Richard W Clark, *Community-School-University Partnerships: Literature Review* (Washington DC: Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence, The George Washington University, May 1998). Richard W Clark, *Effective Professional Development Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999).
- 2 Richard W Clark, "School-University Partnerships: An Interpretive Review," in Kenneth Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad (eds.) *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases and Concerns* (New York: Teacher's College Press, 1988), pp. 32-66.
- 3 John I Goodlad, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990).
- 4 Partnerships do not persist in those situations where seeking status is the main motivator. This may be one of the reasons why the early Holmes work in the western part of the United States faded away while in some of the other states, where more active Holmes partnerships were created, they continue to flourish.
- 5 Private communication, October 22, 1999
- 6 Goodlad, *Teachers for Our Nations Schools*.
- 7 Goodlad, *Teachers for Our Nation's Schools* and John I. Goodlad, *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994).
- 8 Richard W Clark, *Effective Professional Development Schools*, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999), pp. 48-51.
- 9 Jana R Noel, "Collaborative Inquiry in a Partnership Community," *School Community Journal* 6 (Fall/Winter 1996):18-21. Examines a partnership involving Montana State and the Bozeman, Montana schools. Ethne Erskine-Cuillen, "School-University Partnerships as Change Agents: ne Success Story," *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 6 (1995): 192-204. Examines the Learning Consortium in Toronto.
- 10 Kenneth Sirotnik is finishing a comprehensive report on the past 15 years of work in the NNER that provides details to support this generalization. His report should be available from the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington by the winter of 2000.
- 11 One person suggested that divorce and remarriage might be better terms for the 6th and 7th stages. However, in the cases noted here death of partnership activities did not result in remarriage but in the creation of a new entity out of the remains of the dead partnership—hence the notion of reincarnation.

Richard W Clark is a senior associate at the Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington and Institute for Educational Inquiry, Seattle, Washington.
