



Professing Education

A publication of the Society of Professors of Education

July, 2005. Vol 4 No. 1

Editorial

Each year, the Society of Professors of Education presents a number of awards at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association. One such award is the Wisnieski Award for Teacher Education. This award is presented to individuals and groups who have made an outstanding contribution in the area of teacher education. At the AERA meeting in Montreal this past April, 2005, the Wisniewski award was presented to the Southern Maine Partnership from the University of Southern Maine for their stellar work in teacher education. In this special volume of Professing Education we have decided to dedicate the entire issue to their group. We have invited as guest editors the Executive Directors of the Southern Maine Partnership, Drs. Lynn Miller and David Ruff, and we are pleased that they are able to bring to our readership a comprehensive overview of their group's mission.

Editors: John M. Novak & Kenneth A. McClelland
Associate Editors: Dirk Windhorst & Rahul Kumar
Publisher Coordinator: Robert C. Morris
Web Publishing by: Rahul Kumar & Herman Yu

For this and past issues, visit <http://profed.brocku.ca>

Table of Contents

The Southern Maine Partnership and Teacher Education: An Introduction to the Volume <i>Lynne Miller and David Ruff</i>	2
I. Pre-Service Teacher Education	
Pre-Service Teacher Education and the Southern Maine Partnership <i>Lynne Miller and David Ruff</i>	2
The Extended Teacher Education Program <i>Melody Shank, Julie Canniff, and Flynn Ross</i>	3
Teachers (for) Elementary and Middle Schools (TEAMS) Catherine Fallona, Carol Lynne Davies, and Barbara Bales	6
II. A Broader View of Teacher Education	
Broadening the Concept of Teacher Education <i>Lynne Miller and David Ruff</i>	11
Networked Learning as Educator Development <i>Gerry Crocker, JoAnne Dowd, Jean Haeger, Mary Hastings, Mark Kostin,</i> <i>Alexandra MacPhail, Lynne Miller, John Newlin and David Ruff</i>	13
School Coaching as Educator Development <i>Jean Haeger and Mark Kostin</i>	15
Growing Leaders: An Approach to Educator Development <i>Lynne Miller and Cindy O'Shea</i>	17

The Southern Maine Partnership and Teacher Education: An Introduction to the Volume

Lynne Miller and David Ruff

Executive Directors, Southern Maine Partnership

The Southern Maine Partnership is a school-university collaboration that has linked schools and university in support of student learners since 1985. With offices on the Gorham campus of the University of Southern Maine (USM), the Partnership has grown from a group of six school districts to a membership of 36 school districts and USM. Our membership represents over one-third of the public school students and teachers in the state and is the major site for teacher education and leadership development in the region. Member districts pay minimal annual dues and agree to participate in Partnership conversations, activities and projects; to contribute to a developing knowledge base; to share information and practices; and to collaborate in pre-service and ongoing educator development programs. The university contributes one half of a faculty load to Partnership work, provides office space and general support and assistance. The Partnership is an integral part of the College of Education and Human Development and the university at large. Its staff serves on the College's Dean's Advisory Council and its Professional Development Center's Governing Board, as well as on the University's Teacher Education Council.

The Partnership's mission has evolved over time, changing as new issues emerged, new concerns and needs developed, and as the policy context required new forms of action. What has remained constant over time is the Partnership's firm commitment to its values of participation, reciprocity, democracy and collaborative inquiry. An original member of John Goodlad's National Network for Education Renewal, the Partnership still strives for "the simultaneous renewal of schools and the education of educators" by linking school renewal and teacher development in every aspect of its work. The major goal of the Partnership is best expressed as creating and sustaining a culture of educator and

school development with the goal of ensuring all students an equitable, personalized, and rigorous education that prepares them for further education, work, and citizenship.

This issue of *Professing Education* focuses on the Partnership's contributions to teacher education writ large. It is divided into two major sections: Pre-Service and Education and A Broader View of Teacher Education. Each section begins with an article by the editors that contextualizes the work and is followed by pieces, written by University of Southern Maine faculty and Southern Maine Partnership staff, that more fully describe programs and activities.

I. Pre-Service Teacher Education

Pre-Service Teacher Education and the Southern Maine Partnership

Lynne Miller and David Ruff

The University of Southern Maine, like many comprehensive regional universities, has its roots in the normal school movement. It was chartered in 1878 as the Western Maine Normal School. Even though the university grew and diversified its offerings, it was still known regionally as the place where undergraduates could prepare to enter teaching. All of this changed in 1989 when the College of Education voted to disband its undergraduate teacher education programs. The little known story behind this dramatic shift is that in the previous year, eight Southern Maine Partnership member superintendents had drafted a letter to the Dean of the College calling for a major overhaul of its teacher education programs. In a follow-up meeting, the superintendents voiced concerns about the quality of the programs and their disconnect from the practice of schools. They stated that, if given the choice, they would rather hire students prepared elsewhere and would consider USM graduates more suited for positions as technical assistants than as full time classroom teachers.

The University President at the time had a deep commitment to the liberal arts and some disdain

for professional education. When the Dean of the College approached her with the idea of dismantling undergraduate teacher education and replacing it with a post-baccalaureate program that admitted only liberal arts graduates, she embraced the idea. In a pivotal speech to the College faculty, the President offered resources for the new program and a promise of support. A faculty vote affirmed the proposal to suspend all undergraduate teacher education programs and to move to a new graduate model. The Director of the Southern Maine Partnership was asked to lead the development of the new program and to serve as its initial director.

A pilot of the new program began in the fall of 1990. It admitted fourteen students to a 30 credit hour graduate program leading to certification as a middle school teacher. The new program, as yet untitled, was developed in collaboration with Wells Junior High School, a Southern Maine Partnership school with whom a member of the teacher education faculty had existing ties. After only six months of planning, the pilot program began. It was structured around a set of common core principles that still influence the university's teacher education programs. These core principles are: school-university collaboration in program planning and administration, collaborative admissions processes, a cohort group of interns placed for a full year in a partner school, an adherence to the school—rather than university—calendar, integration of theory and practice, the valuing of teacher voice, site-based courses that are collaboratively planned and taught, intensive supervision, and reflective practice (Miller and Silvernail, 1994). These principles were influenced by the work of the Goodlad network as well as the emerging movement toward professional development schools.

The pilot program formed the basis for what was later called the Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP), which has been widely recognized as an exemplary graduate level teacher education program (Darling-Hammond, Ed, 2000). Some years later, ETEP became the model for a new undergraduate teacher education program at the university, Teachers for Elementary and Middle Schools (TEAMS). The Southern Maine Partnership and pre-service education

at the university continue their collaboration as new needs arise and new programs develop.

References

- Miller, L. & Silvernail, D. (1994). Wells Junior High School: Evolution of a professional development school. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed) *Professional development schools: Schools for a developing profession*, 28-49. New York: Teachers College Press.

The Extended Teacher Education Program

Melody Shank, Julie Canniff, and Flynn Ross

The Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP) at the University of Southern Maine has received acclaim as an exemplary post-baccalaureate teacher education program (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Known for its foundation in strong school-university partnerships, the program provides recent bachelor's degree recipients and career changers the opportunity to learn to be teachers in a coherent nine-month program. The program combines an extensive internship with graduate level coursework through which interns develop the skills and understandings for teaching in increasingly demanding school contexts. The program's strength is founded on the university and area schools' commitment to continuous renewal and excellence.

ETEP's Inception

When ETEP was initiated in 1989, USM's College of Education and Human Development took a bold and controversial step. ETEP replaced a large well-established, conventionally organized undergraduate elementary teacher education program and several smaller secondary programs, all of which provided the university a steady flow of tuition revenue. The change was inspired by teacher education faculty and superintendents from Southern Maine school districts who collaboratively studied the prevailing ideas about teacher education and the needs of area school districts. During the study, superintendents claimed that USM teacher candidates were not adequately prepared for the demands of the reforms underway in area schools. They concluded that

ETEP, a much smaller post-baccalaureate program, would produce more rigorously trained teachers who had strong content knowledge connected to learning standards, an emerging teaching philosophy, and the ability to continuously examine their teaching practices. More importantly, as a school-university partnership, the program would be rooted in the practices and needs of schools as well as the most current educational theories. The context for preparing high quality teachers would therefore become a site for continuous responsive and collaborative inquiry.

The structure of the program ensures that school and university-based educators, called site coordinators, together direct all aspects of the program for a cohort of 15-25 interns in each of the partnership sites. The cohort at each site provides interns a context for social learning and support, as well as a means to learn the facets of collegiality. Many of the courses in the 33-credit graduate program are taught by school-based instructors at the school sites where interns learn alongside exemplary practicing teachers (mentors) in two semester-long internships. The site coordinators and mentors coach the interns in their classroom placements, and strive to link theories with classroom practice.

Changes Over Time

One of the strengths of partner school-based teacher education is captured in the program's ability to be responsive to schools' practices and needs. As ETEP has developed and changed, the inquiry process employed to initiate ETEP – school and university-based educators working together to learn in and from their practice about how to best educate teachers, has continued, and is still alive today. This process enables ETEP and USM's other initial teacher certification program faculty to ground their work in common principles and practices and adjust the program to meet the needs of ever-changing educational contexts in the partner sites and the state. Over the past 15 years, this collaborative inquiry process has resulted in broadened and changed partner school participation, a deepened commitment to common principles and practices, a more coherent experience for interns, and, most recently, expanded program options.

Two years after the initial cohort in Wells/Ogunquit, ETEP expanded to four additional partner school sites: Gorham, Portland, Yarmouth and Fryeburg. Later, three of these sites grew to include additional school districts - the Yarmouth site became Casco Bay and included the Falmouth and Cumberland-North Yarmouth school districts; the Wells/Ogunquit site became SWYK, including the districts in Sanford, York and Kittery; and the Fryeburg site became Western Maine and added two other rural districts. Only Portland and Gorham remained single district partner sites. By 2000, ETEP offered K-8, 7-12, and K-12 teacher certification in five partnerships sites and 13 school districts. The enrollment in the program grew from 14 interns in the pilot cohort to between 90 and 115 interns across the five sites.

The shape of the partnerships has changed as the resources and commitments of the districts and university have waxed and waned. After several years of expansion, sites were again reconfigured in 2003 due to financial retrenchment at the university and new program directions in some of the school districts and the USM Teacher Education Department. The Casco Bay site was closed; Western Maine returned to its original K-8 district in Fryeburg and was combined with K-8 schools in Gorham; a new secondary site combining existing middle and high schools in Western Maine and Gorham was created to focus on the needs of secondary school reform and teacher preparation; and the Portland site became a partner district for not only 9-month ETEP, but other USM teacher education programs.

Common Principles and Practices

During the period of site expansion in the 1990s, the faculty worked diligently to develop common principles and practices to provide coherence and focus across all cohorts. In 1993, eleven outcomes were outlined as the focus for interns' learning and as the basis for the performance-based assessment system that faculty later developed. Today, twelve teaching standards create the backbone for all USM teacher education programs. These standards, based on the INTASC standards include the following dimensions of teaching:

- Knowledge of Child/Adolescent Development and Principles of Learning
- Knowledge of Subject Matter and Inquiry
- Instructional Planning
- Instructional Strategies
- Technology
- Assessment
- Diversity & Cultural Responsiveness
- Beliefs About Teaching and Learning
- Citizenship
- Collaboration and Professionalism
- Professional Development
- Classroom Management

Two of these standards have been revised in the past five years.

The current performance-based assessment system, used to determine interns' competence as beginning teachers, was developed to provide a common set of evidence across all sites of interns' performance. By the end of the program interns demonstrate their competence of the 12 standards through these "shared assessments:" a teaching philosophy or stance, a student case study or set of student profiles, a curriculum unit, written reflections on teaching, observations and assessments of teaching performance, and a culminating portfolio/exhibition. ETEP site coordinators, course instructors, and in some cases, mentors have periodically come together to define common criteria for the shared assessments. Most recently, the school and university-based coordinators revised three of the shared assessments and came to a renewed agreement about the purpose of the culminating portfolio/exhibition.

As an additional means to maintain coherence across ETEP sites, and ultimately across programs, the faculty collaboratively identified these five program commitments to ground all USM teacher education programs:

- Integration of course curriculum with internship experiences, as a means for fostering on-going dialogue between theory and practice
- Performance-based assessment of teaching standards
- Intensive mentored fieldwork

- Continued and strengthened partnerships with schools
- Cohort model for teaching candidates.

The faculty deems these features the foundation for program excellence, and therefore all new programs developed in the past several years have these commitments as their starting place.

New Program Options

In the past seven years, the Teacher Education Department has increased access to teacher education for a broader audience of candidates through several new program pathways. These new pathways have been created in response to needs in particular school districts and across the state for well-prepared teachers in particular teaching areas.

At the undergraduate level, in addition to the TEAMS program, two pathways to initial teacher certification at the secondary level have been developed. To provide greater opportunities for mathematics majors interested in teaching, the USM mathematics and teacher education departments jointly designed and now coordinate a Secondary Mathematics Education program. The Math Education interns, who graduate with a major in mathematics and have a solid background in adolescent development and educational theories, join an existing ETEP cohort during their final internship year. These students demonstrate their teaching competence through the same performance assessment system as ETEP interns, and enjoy mentored classroom placements. A similar program for modern and classical languages majors will be implemented in 2006.

Within ETEP, four new pathways address issues of access and the teacher shortage in the region. In 2000, Newcomer ETEP, a two-year program for linguistically and culturally diverse candidates, was designed to meet the needs of the refugee and immigrant communities in the Portland Public Schools. The Newcomer ETEP program was designed to provide para-professionals within the school district and aspiring teachers within the ethnic communities a supportive teacher education program. In addition to the ETEP program standards,

Newcomer ETEP provides assistance for developing English language skills, meeting standardized testing requirements, and understanding the educational system and teaching in the United States.

In 2004, a 2-year version of ETEP for secondary candidates was initiated to increase access to teacher education for those candidates whose financial or life situations did not afford them the opportunity to do the nine-month intensive program. The program increases the options for those candidates in the shortage areas of mathematics, science and world languages. It has the same program dimensions and expectations as the nine-month program, but extends the coursework over two academic years, and places interns in part-time internships.

The K-8 Unified ETEP option, designed primarily for education paraprofessionals, seeks to “grow special education teachers where they live” and prepare teachers to teach all students, especially those with disabilities. The K-8 Unified ETEP option is a two-year pathway to certification in both general and special education, and a master’s degree in special education.

The program is individualized to meet the specific work parameters of interns within their school districts. This program challenges conventional understandings of cohort-based teacher education and classroom-based courses by providing the majority of course work in an on-line format.

A similar unified approach to teacher certification at the secondary level is also on the drawing board. The Unified Secondary ETEP option, to begin in 2006, will provide interested candidates the option to pursue certification in both a chosen content area and 7-12 special education, and a master’s degree in special education in a 3-year program. The program will target conditionally certified teachers, paraprofessionals, and pre-service candidates. The intent of this program is to meet the need for highly qualified secondary educators in the state, who have a solid background in teaching a specific subject and have highly honed skills for teaching the diverse range of students in inclusive and standards-based secondary school settings.

Conclusion

With all of the changes that have occurred in ETEP over the years, the fabric of the program has taken on many colors while retaining its basic purposes and design. The faculty and partner school districts continue to be committed to the qualities of an outstanding teacher education program: a vivid portrait of good teaching; articulated standards of teaching performance; intensive coached field experiences; a strong curriculum grounded in knowledge of students, learning theory and pedagogy; integration of the curriculum with everyday teaching practices; strong partnerships; and performance assessment (Darling-Hammond, 2000). The program remains strong because the faculty continually revisits and fine-tunes the practice of these commitments in the face of challenges and new ideas. As it expects of its graduates, the faculty continues to learn in and through its practices.

References

Darling-Hammond, L. (Ed.). (2000). *Studies of excellence in teacher education: Preparation at the graduate level*. Wash., D.C.: AACTE Publications.

Teachers (for) Elementary and Middle Schools (TEAMS)

Catherine Fallona, Carol Lynn Davis, and Barbara Bales

The Teachers for Elementary and Middle Schools Program (TEAMS) was designed to fill the void in teacher preparation that had been created in 1989 when the USM education faculty voted to disband its undergraduate program in favor of the graduate level Extended Teacher Education Program. Built on the principles and practices of ETEP, it offers undergraduates the same rich array of coursework and practical experience as ETEP over a period of four and one half years.

Currently completing its seventh year of implementation, TEAMS is based on the same guiding principles and uses the same standards and assessments as ETEP.

The program is intended for undergraduates who identify a strong interest in teaching at the elementary and/or middle school level. It is a cohort-based program that is designed to ensure that students have a strong background in both the liberal arts and professional education. As such, it leads to a degree in a liberal arts field and certification as an elementary teacher, K-8, in Maine. Like ETEP, the program combines coursework and field experiences. Upon completion, it confers on students a bachelor's degree in a liberal arts area, K-8 teacher certification, and 33 earned credit hours toward a Masters of Science degree in education with a concentration in teaching and learning.

A unique feature of the TEAMS Program is that it prepares students to teach science and mathematics, areas where there is currently a shortage of teachers in the elementary and middle schools of the state. This strong foundation in science and mathematics is achieved through coursework that exceeds university and state requirements: students are required to successfully complete three mathematics content courses as well as three science content courses with laboratory experiences. Courses have been specifically developed which integrate the study of the disciplines of mathematics and the sciences with courses in education that enhance the understanding in those disciplines. Computer-based technology is also incorporated throughout the program to help teacher education students develop understanding and facility with technology as an important tool for learning and teaching.

The Mission of TEAMS

The mission of the TEAMS Program is based on key concepts as articulated by the National Network for Educational Renewal Agenda (Goodlad, 1994). The following is a description of the key concepts that act as guiding principles for the TEAMS Program and how they relate the program's mission:

- University Collaboration with Partner Schools: For the effective delivery of the TEAMS Program, a partnership has been established with five schools (3 elementary schools and 2 middle schools) across three school districts in the Southern Maine area. These schools are used for field placements

and internship sited for TEAMS students. The faculty in these schools work with university faculty and share the responsibility for preparing the next generation of teachers.

- Stewardship: Teachers are stewards for the healthy development of students, and they must consistently model those virtues advocated for compassionate and active citizens. The TEAMS Program aims to foster preservice teachers' sense of stewardship by educating them about their role in preparing the next generation for citizenship in a democratic society.
- Simultaneous Renewal: The TEAMS Program and its partner schools are engaged in an effort to continuously improve what they do. The TEAMS Program and its partner schools aim to work together and share their talents so that the students served by each educational setting reap benefits. Each organization is simultaneously renewed as they work together to improve what they do.
- Nurturing Pedagogy: TEAMS Program faculty members teach in ways that both enrich and encourage students. The way they engage learners, the activities they plan and conduct, and the feedback they give students are all designed to help students attain high expectations and to encourage them toward continued learning.
- Equal Access to Equitable Educational Opportunities: The TEAMS Program faculty believes that all children deserve a schooling experience that helps them reach their potential and welcomes them into full participation in a democratic society by providing the knowledge and skills needed for successful citizenship.

In addition to these foundational principles, an important feature of the program is that students participate as members of a learning community. Beginning with the first year and continuing throughout the program, students participate in educational coursework and field experiences as a cohort group. The learning community culture serves to support students in understanding the aims, principles, and practices of education as a discipline and teaching as a professional activity. In

this endeavor, cohort members also act as important resources for one another during their process of learning to teach and teaching to learn.

The Three Phases of TEAMS: Combining Courses and Fieldwork

The TEAMS Program has three distinct phases through which the students progress. The three levels are pre-candidacy, candidacy, and internship. Pre-candidacy begins upon admission to the program. For students who enter as freshman, this phase is six semesters in length. Students complete USM Core Curriculum requirements, courses in their selected major in the College of Arts and Sciences, and the undergraduate level education courses and field experiences that the TEAMS Program requires. Students focus on developing basic competencies in the liberal arts and in math and science. In addition, they complete work in an academic major and take one education course each semester. With the exception of a social foundation course, all of the education courses have a weekly seminar and a 24-hour a semester field experience.

During the second semester of the program, students have their first field experience as a part of a Children's Literature course. The seminar and field experience for children's literature provides students with the opportunity to learn about and work with children on literacy development.

The third semester course in the TEAMS Program focuses on the relationship between culture, community and schooling. Here field placements occur in the greater Portland area and include Head Start, Before and After School programs, community programs for adolescents, and local resource programs for individuals with low income status. Students have ample opportunities to analyze and reflect on the understanding of their own culture as it relates to the understanding of others' cultures. This course supports TEAMS students in reflecting upon related field experiences as they explore and develop culturally responsive teaching practices.

In the fourth semester, academic and fieldwork are combined in a course in Middle School Community that addresses issues of culture and community in a specific middle level context.

Students are assigned to a host teacher at one of the middle school partner schools in order to gain classroom experience with middle school students. The fieldwork combines participant observation with classroom teacher responsibilities. Additionally, seminars on-site at middle schools that include tours of the school and presentations by students, teachers, and administrators, provide an opportunity for students to learn more about the context of different middle schools as well as middle level learners.

In the fifth semester, students take the course, Theoretical Foundations of Learning, which examines theories of learning and their application to teaching and learning practices. This course includes a field experience that includes participant observation as well as opportunities for developing and teaching learning activities.

In the sixth and final semester of the program, students take Portfolio Development, a course that prepares students for their Candidacy Review. Through Candidacy Review, all TEAMS students demonstrate readiness for and commitment to the demands of teaching as a career. Through the development and presentation of his/her portfolio, the TEAMS student must show evidence that their knowledge and disposition is developing satisfactorily according to the College of Education and Human Development Teaching Standard. The Candidacy Review is both a formative and summative process that leads to a judgment about a candidate's progress in the program. The review is designed to assure TEAMS students and other constituents that candidates have demonstrated the prerequisite knowledge and dispositions before progressing to the second phase of the program. The Review is designed as a positive and constructive learning experience where each student has the opportunity to present, synthesize, answer questions, utilize technology, integrate, prepare materials, reflect, make connections, and receive feedback from university and partner school faculty. Through the Review, students provide evidence that they are making satisfactory progress toward completing the liberal arts and science major and they are eligible to progress to the internship.

More specifically, they present evidence that they are progressing toward meeting the first six of Teaching Standards (See Shank, Canniff, & Ross above). These are:

1. Knowledge of Child/Adolescent Development and Principles of Learning: The teacher demonstrates respect, concern for children, and an understanding of how they continue to develop and learn. S/he uses this knowledge to plan and guide instruction and to create a challenging, supportive learning environment.
2. Knowledge of Subject Matter and Inquiry: The teacher understands the framework of the subject matter(s) s/he teaches and makes accessible to students the discipline’s tools of inquiry, central concepts, internal structure, and connections to other domains of knowledge, in a manner that promotes the learner’s independent inquiry.
3. Technology: The teacher demonstrates an understanding of technology operations; enhances his/her productivity and professional practice using technology; understands the social, legal and ethical issues surrounding the use of technology; plans and designs effective learning environments supported by technology; implements curriculum plans that include methods and strategies for applying technology to enhance student learning; and applies technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies. (NETS)
4. Diversity and Cultural Responsiveness: The teacher models respect for cultural and individual differences among students and coworkers including race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, learning style, age, religion, socioeconomic status and ability/disability. S/he selects instructional materials from a variety of cultural perspectives and plans and creates learning opportunities and assessments that attend to issues of diversity and cultural responsiveness and ensure access and equity for all students.
5. Beliefs About Teaching and Learning: The teacher clearly communicates his/her beliefs about learning, teaching, assessment, and the role of education in society, and demonstrates practices that support those beliefs.
6. Collaboration and Professionalism: The teacher demonstrates professional responsibility to school and

community. S/he works collaboratively with colleagues, parents, and community members to improve the conditions of learning for all students and adults.

Candidacy is the shortest phase of the program and lasts for one semester. Students are eligible for internship placement upon completion of candidacy. In this phase, students complete the academic major and a course in Exceptionality. The Exceptionality course builds upon students’ experiences and knowledge about the diversity of learners and ways to promote a positive learning environment for all students. In the 24-hour field experience students work with students identified with special needs.

The Full Year Graduate Internship earns TEAMS students 33 credit hours toward their master’s degree in Education: Teaching and Learning. As a part of the graduate level internship, students complete two semester long placements in TEAMS partner schools. Since their certification is K-8, one placement is at the elementary level and the other is at the middle level. As the culminating year of the program, TEAMS students have the greatest responsibility for teaching, with full-time teaching in a partner school expected across much of the year. Throughout the internship year, TEAMS students focus on learning to balance classroom teacher responsibilities of creating a caring classroom environment conducive to learning with teaching multiple disciplines.

Concurrent to their internship placements, they complete professional coursework in math, science, literacy, and social studies. The mathematics methods course is based on the standards of the National Council on the Teaching of Mathematics and involves students in developing their abilities in learning and teaching mathematics. The course emphasizes a problem-solving approach, an orientation to disciplinary inquiry in mathematics, and the use of technology as a learning tool. The science methods course is based on the National Standards in Science Education and involves students in developing their own understanding in science (particularly in the physical and earth sciences, areas in which elementary school teachers

feel least prepared to teach), as well as developing an inquiry-oriented approach to teaching. The courses focused on literacy introduce them to strategies for teaching reading and writing. The social studies methods course focuses on the disciplines of history, geography, sociology and cultural anthropology. In this course, students explore the disciplines of the social sciences and learn how to help young children use original artifacts to learn about and interpret other cultures and other times.

The internship year also includes a weekly seminar that supports TEAMS students in discussing and reflecting upon their classroom experiences. The seminar is specifically geared to support students in systematically analyzing their practice. TEAMS students are expected to be able to critically reflect upon their practice with respect to the challenges that they face and the repertoire of effective teacher attributes which they bring to addressing those challenges, including the role of systematic reflection in facilitating learning from one's practice.

Students continue to demonstrate evidence toward the first six Teaching Standards used for Candidacy Review while demonstrating evidence toward the additional 6 Teaching Standards:

7. Instructional Planning: The teacher consistently plans and evaluates instruction based on knowledge of the learner, the subject matter, the community, the intended student outcomes, instructional strategies and representations, and the curriculum.
8. Instructional Strategies: The teacher understands and uses a variety of teaching strategies and tools, to promote learning and independent inquiry for all students.
9. Assessment: The teacher enhances and documents learning through continuing use of formal and informal assessment strategies, communicates feedback, and promotes guided self-evaluation in learners.
10. Citizenship: The teacher understands principles of democratic community and plans instruction to promote ideals, values, and practices of citizenship.
11. Professional Development: The teacher recognizes that s/he is, above all, a learner. S/he continually reflects on and evaluates choices and actions, and

seeks out opportunities for professional development as well as ways to improve teaching and learning.

12. Classroom Management: The teacher understands and implements classroom management techniques that support individual responsibility and the principles of democratic community. Progress towards meeting all 12 of the standards is evaluated during goal setting at the beginning of each placement, mid-placement, and at the end of each placement.

Since TEAMS is a partnership program, both university and partner school faculty are responsible for evaluating students' progress in relation to these standards. TEAMS uses the same assessment set as ETEP. These assessments include a case study or classroom profile, a reflective teaching journal, two teaching units, a professional vision or platform statement, an action research project, and a professional portfolio with a final presentation/exhibition. Success in these assessments during professional internship in partner schools results in a recommendation for a K-8 teaching certificate in the State of Maine.

Changes over Time

Three years after its inception, a major redesign took place in the TEAMS program that was related to when students could be admitted into the program and the advising of students during their program. In the original design, 20-25 first year undergraduates were admitted into the program each year and this group of students created a cohort that progressed through the program together. Each incoming cohort was assigned to a TEAMS faculty member who advised the cohort, taught the specific field-based TEAMS course to the cohort each semester, and mentored the cohort during their internship year. Several issues arose as this design was implemented. The attrition rate of students withdrawing from the TEAMS program was quite high for various reasons. Some TEAMS students discovered, through the early education courses and field placement experiences, that teaching was not the appropriate career for them. Some TEAMS students were not able to successfully negotiate the rigorous nature of the combination of TEAMS courses and field experiences, core

curriculum coursework, and the liberal arts major. Some TEAMS students left the program for personal reasons such as relocation, marriage, and limited financial resources.

Although faculty members who became TEAMS advisors discovered many rewards and benefits in advising, teaching, and mentoring a cohort of TEAMS students, there were challenges in teaching a new course each semester and problem-solving the logistics and issues relating to the implementation of a new program. Thus, it was decided that the TEAMS program would be redesigned to include admitting students into the program any time during their first two undergraduate years. In addition to the 20-25 first year undergraduate cohort of students who are admitted into the program, both internal and external transfers with less than 50 earned credits are admitted into the program in the pre-candidacy phase. After a transcript analysis, transfer students are placed into the specific cohort that best meets their academic needs. These students often need to take two TEAMS courses per semester to complete the TEAMS coursework required before candidacy. As a result of this change in the program and to meet the program needs of the students, the internship year may begin in January for some students and in September for other students. The redesign of TEAMS also involved a change in the responsibilities of a TEAMS faculty advisor.

It was decided that the TEAMS students would benefit from having learning experiences with numerous faculty members; thus, the TEAMS faculty currently teach one or two TEAMS courses that are the best fit with their expertise. TEAMS students are assigned a faculty member as an advisor when they are admitted into the program and this faculty member continues to advise them throughout their program.

New Program Initiatives

Over the past four years, TEAMS has benefited from a \$4 million, five year Maine Mathematics and Science Teaching Excellence Collaborative (MMSTEC) grant funded by the National Science Foundation. This grant has provided scholarships for TEAMS students who choose mathematics or science as their liberal arts major or minor. In addition to the scholarships, the

grant funded curriculum design work for a General Contract Science major with a life science, physical science, or earth science concentration. This major was designed by the MMSTEC Steering Committee in collaboration with TEAMS faculty to specifically meet the needs of elementary and/or middle schoolteachers of science.

Currently, there are increasing numbers of TEAMS students who are choosing this General Contract science major due to its availability and viability as an appropriate major for the TEAMS program. In collaboration with faculty members from the College of Arts and Science, the TEAMS faculty is exploring the possibility of the implementation of a Liberal Studies major with a 24 concentration in one academic area. This Liberal Studies major would have the potential of providing TEAMS students with more breadth in knowledge and understanding in liberal arts as well as more depth in at least one specific liberal arts area. TEAMS faculty are also collaborating with CEHD faculty from the Special Education programs to explore options for how special education courses and practicum might be integrated into the TEAMS curriculum so that TEAMS students who have an interest in pursuing certification in Special Education may be afforded that opportunity.

References

Goodlad, J. I. (1994). *Educational renewal: Better teachers, better schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

II. A Broader View of Teacher Education

Broadening the Concept of Teacher Education

Lynne Miller and David Ruff

The Southern Maine Partnership was founded on the power of three: pre-service teacher education, ongoing professional development, and the transformation of schooling. To that end, we have broadened the concept of teacher education to include the deepening of teaching practice for in-service teachers, the development and support of school leaders, and the transformation of schools to

support equitable, personal, and rigorous learning for all students.

We ground this broader view in what Lieberman and Miller (1999) term learning out of school, that is, providing the opportunity for educators to explore knowledge from outside the boundaries and visions of their own schools (p. 70). “In this model...teachers find themselves in groups...who have been brought together to reinvent, learn, and teach each other ways of working in school, and put them in touch with colleagues who are working on similar problems of practice. [These groups] give teachers opportunities to expand their repertoires and to become mentors, organizers, curriculum writers, and professional developers in their own right” (p. 71).

Over time, we have had to invent and re-invent processes, strategies, and venues for learning out of school. Our original structures are still in place, and they have been complemented by new processes, strategies, and approaches. Membership dues continue to support a myriad of professional learning opportunities for educators across school boundaries and years of experience. These include: Dine and Discuss evenings, collaborative inquiry groups, writing for print and non-print publications, telecommunications and face to face conversations, reviews of student and teacher work, opportunities to design and participate in university degree programs, leadership seminars, role-alike groups, small and large group presentations, briefings on research and information about practice, and short institutes and conferences.

New opportunities have grown as the result of grant-funded work. Two of these grant-funded projects are described below: The Learner-Centered Accountability Project (LCA) was a five year project, funded by the Robert T. Noyce Foundation and the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation, that lasted from 1997 until 2001 and focused on creating assessment and accountability systems in six member high schools. The idea was to bring together a group of schools that were committed to developing assessment systems that did more than just measure student achievement, but were willing to consider those aspects of their

organizations that actually supported or impeded student learning. The Partnership engaged the school faculties, within and across school boundaries, in a cycle of inquiry that set clear goals, collected and analyzed data, researched and learned about potential solutions, designed appropriate professional learning opportunities, implemented action plans, and then re-analyzed data to see if increases in student achievement had occurred. Data collected focused on several areas: student attainment, instructional practices, school organizational design, leadership, and school/community collaboration. As a result of the project, teachers developed the capacity to analyze and use data; they developed achievement profiles for different segments of the school population; they learned how the school’s organization and its instructional practices impacted achievement; and they tried out and implemented new structures and practices and evaluated their effectiveness.

The Great Maine Schools Project (GMS), which began in 2003 and is funded until 2008 by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, is a collaborative effort by the Southern Maine Partnership, the Senator George J. Mitchell Scholarship Research Institute, and the Center for Educational Transformation at the Maine Department of Education to reshape secondary education in the State of Maine. The project promotes the implementation of the vision of schools that is at the center of the Southern Maine Partnership’s mission: an equitable, personalized, and rigorous education that prepares individuals for further education, work, and citizenship. Through the GMS, Partnership “coaches” work extensively in eighteen schools throughout the state to assist teachers and administrators as they examine classroom instructional practices, school structures, policies and procedures. In many ways, the work of the coaches in the GMS schools builds on the LCA Project: they work with educators to collect and analyze data, and use that data to change practice. However, the Great Maine Schools Project has a wider reach; it extends beyond assessment and accountability concerns and aims to redesign the whole school on behalf of the learning of all students.

The GMS schools are part of a larger network that extends across the state and engages educators in “out-of school” professional learning and sharing. In both dues and grant funded work, the Southern Maine Partnership strives to develop new and useful venues for educator growth and development that lead to the development of schools that fulfill the promise of public education.

References

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1999). *Teachers: Transforming their world and their work*. New York: Teachers College press.

Networked Learning as Educator Development

Gerry Crocker, JoAnne Dowd, Jean Haeger, Mary Hastings, Mark Kostin, Alexandra MacPhail, Lynne Miller, John Newlin and David Ruff

Networked learning is gaining recognition as a form of educator development that extends beyond traditional definitions of teacher education and professional development. As Lieberman and Miller (1999) note, networks provide a way for teachers to learn away from their own schools and in collaboration with others. “Networks encourage trust, build support, and provide additional avenues for teacher learning... These groups provide teachers with continual stimulation and ideas and put them in touch with colleagues who are working on similar problems of practice” (p. 71). Over time, the Southern Maine Partnership has helped to develop many networks as venues for educator learning. Each site is distinct in purpose and audience; each is powerful in bringing together people to share ideas and explore thorny issues together. Below, we describe a sampling of Partnership networks.

Curriculum Think Tank

For over fifteen years, the Curriculum Think Tank has been a place for Partnership educators who are charged with overseeing the curriculum work of their districts to gather monthly to discuss common issues and concerns. Group activities vary from seminars based on texts, presentations, open-ended discussions and structured conversations, problem-posing, and

problem-solving. Most recently, the attention of the group has focused on the assessment requirements of the state of Maine and the federal government. Group members share ideas and practices and support each other in their efforts to lead the educational agendas of their districts. Since each district has but one curriculum coordinator, the Think Tank is a place for a role group to gather and gain support. Often, as a result of these meetings, members develop smaller regional alliances for curriculum and assessment work.

Dine and Discuss

One of the long-standing networking traditions of the Southern Maine Partnership is the “Dine and Discuss” event. There are usually two or three such events offered each month of the school year. These events can have different purposes, but they all share the attribute of bringing educators together from many schools to learn (and eat) together. Dine and Discuss events typically occur from 4-7 pm. Light refreshments are available beforehand, and dinner usually begins at 6pm, leaving two hours for the program. In many cases, educators approach SMP staff to propose a Dine and Discuss topic that they either are hungry to learn more about or that they want to facilitate a conversation around. In addition, Dine and Discuss topics occasionally arise from a desire on the part of SMP staff to “test the waters” with an idea for a new SMP project or initiative or to respond to concerns they hear emerging from the members. Dine and Discuss events are publicized primarily through the Southern Maine Partnership calendar one or two months in advance; these calendars are distributed in bulk to each SMP school.

Learner Centered Accountability Project

As the Southern Maine Partnership began to develop more grant-funded projects in the 1990’s, our networking strategies became more diverse. Three annual large assessment conferences were held in the early 1990’s that brought SMP educators together to discuss assessment practices. In the mid-1990 the Learner Centered Accountability Project began, which involved six high schools over a period of three years. Networking meetings that brought

together small teams from each of these six schools occurred quarterly. Each summer, the high schools involved in the LCA Project sent a team of faculty members to a retreat location (near a lake or the ocean) for five days of intense learning and planning. When the LCA Project ended, the Retreat continued, albeit with some changes. School participation has steadily increased each year so that in the summer of 2004 thirteen schools and over 80 faculty members were involved.

The Large School Collaborative

In the summer of 2003 the principals of six large high schools (over 1,000 students) in Maine had lunch together at the Great Maine Schools Summer Institute at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine. The purpose of the gathering was to determine how to collaborate in making changes in their schools that would improve equity, rigor, and personalization for every student. Originally, these schools were funded for a year with the idea that one or two of them would make great strides, “rise to the top”, and be awarded a larger grant for continuing their work over the remaining four years. Rather than compete, the six principals agreed to collaborate and learn from one another, staying together over the life of the grant (five years). Since then, the six principals have become a professional and personal support system, hosting lunch every six weeks in one of their schools, with focused discussions on school wide issues such as shared leadership, guidance programs, parent engagement, decision-making policies and processes, and focused professional development. These discussions are facilitated by coaches from the Southern Maine Partnership who work closely with them to implement the goals of the Great Maine Schools Project to make the changes they envision in their schools. Between meetings, cyberspace hums with emails asking for advice and support around topics such as advanced placement courses, teacher assignments, and student engagement. This past year two other principals of large high schools were invited to join the collaboration because the work of their schools resonated with the Great Maine Schools Project. The collaboration doesn’t end with the principals.

Teams of teachers from each school began monthly cross school visits, observing and learning from school practices such as advisories, teaming structures, early college programs, and assessment strategies. This year, school teams have met every other month to review school data, learn successful strategies, and plan and undertake actions. Additionally, the principals, teachers, parents and students from the collaborative schools have conducted school visits with schools across the New England region and New York City to learn about successful restructuring processes and policies. The outcomes to date of these collaborative efforts include increasing restructuring efforts across the schools and the value of knowing that none of them stands alone as the leader of a large school.

The Triad

During the first Summer Institute of the Great Maine Schools Project, participant schools ended their experience by engaging in triad consultancies to give and receive feedback on their first year action plans. The productive dialogue the groups engaged in at this event prompted three schools to continue collaborating. The two Partnership coaches assigned to the schools helped them organize a series of school visits through a Dine and Discuss event. At that event, the schools created norms that have continued to guide their work together. One unique norm is that students be an integral part of all triad activities. Teams from each of the three schools brainstormed issues they were wrestling with and eventually identified an essential question for the other schools to focus their observations. Each school hosted a team of six to eight teachers and students who toured the school, observed classes and learned about the school. At the end of the day, the teams gathered and participated in a consultancy facilitated by the Partnership coaches.

At the second Summer Institute, the schools requested an opportunity to participate together in shared professional development. The partnership coaches hosted and facilitated a planning meeting with school teams of students and teachers to determine some common goals around increasing equity, rigor, and personalization for students, echoing the goals of

the grant. One clear area that emerged as a topic was to make advisories (small communities of students and teachers) more meaningful. All three schools have advisories at different stages of development, from a fledgling program to a school with seasoned advisories. The planning teams decided that they could benefit from a day-long training on best practices in advisory. Partnership coaches contacted an experienced advisory trainer to provide professional development, and organized a day-long event. The schools agreed to cost share and submitted individual goals for the day, which were incorporated by the facilitator. Feedback from the event reflected the added value of having mixed voices of students, teachers and administrators from different schools. The schools hope to continue their collaboration into their future. They have identified a common interest in increasing student voice in their respective schools.

Professional Learning Communities

Over the last ten years, The Southern Maine Partnership has helped schools form Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). Professional Learning Communities are based on the assumptions that teachers are learners and that instead of existing and working in isolation, they are a community that can support as well as push each other’s practice in a safe environment. The structures of PLC’s can be formalized, such as in Critical Friends’ Groups, where groups of teachers meet regularly and examine their own practice; they look at student work as a way of increasing student achievement as well as deepening teacher practice. PLC’s may also exist more organically as part of a school’s professional development strategy or as a part of regularly scheduled gatherings of teachers such as faculty and department meetings, content area discussions, grade level meetings, and new teacher groups. The centerpiece of the work of the PLC is the use of protocols. These are structured conversations that allow for focused and meaningful discussions of a variety of issues in diverse circumstances and settings.

Promoting 21st Century Learning and Teaching

Two years ago, Maine implemented one-to-one laptop computing in middle schools through a statewide initiative. This year, approximately thirty-five Maine

high schools have taken the bold step of growing the laptop initiative to the secondary level. The Southern Maine Partnership was invited to assist in the implementation of this ambitious statewide strategy by offering a course that provides professional development and integrates literacy, universal design and technology in a cohesive way to ensure personalization for all learners. The course, called 21st Century Learning and Teaching, offers a model for designing student-centered curriculum for classrooms rich in both digital technology and content areas by using a planning backwards approach. Participants develop a standards-based unit framed around an essential question and outcomes that identify what students should know or be able to do. The unit is designed to integrate a variety of teaching, learning, and literacy strategies that prepare students for a culminating performance assessment. Emphasis is placed on developing a relevant context for students, especially through connecting to the community. During the course, teachers become part of a professional learning community giving and receiving feedback on the unit development. Once the unit is implemented, participants will examine the student work and reflect on ways to improve their practice. An initial offering of the course runs from February 2005 through July 2005 and concludes with a 3-day summer institute. In subsequent years, the course will be available to a larger audience of middle and high school teachers across the state.

School Coaching as Educator Development

Jean Haeger and Mark Kostin

The pressure and the need to improve our nation’s high schools are arguably the greatest they have been in the last fifty years. Secondary principals and teachers must work quickly, yet thoughtfully, to identify the steps they should take to ensure a high quality education for all students. Traditionally, high schools have been alone in their improvement efforts; however, a growing number have been successful in breaking down the barriers of isolation by working with a school improvement coach. An outside school

coach, if properly prepared and sensitive to individual as well as whole school concerns, can provide meaningful professional development for teachers. By balancing pressure and support, a coach can help initiate and sustain meaningful school improvement (Evans, 2000).

The Southern Maine Partnership has developed a coaching model that supports educator and school development simultaneously with the goal of transforming schools and teaching so that every student is fully prepared for college, work, and citizenship. To that end, we support the development of equitable, rigorous, and personalized learning opportunities for all students and have developed coaching strategies to support development in four areas: classroom practice, organizational design and culture, leadership, and community connections. In our role as school coaches, we spend considerable time directly supporting teacher professional growth, particularly in the areas of classroom practice and leadership. In what follows, we will describe the context of our school coaching work and how we continually support teachers' ongoing professional growth, such as deepening their classroom practice, supporting professional learning communities, enhancing shared leadership knowledge and skills, and assisting in the analysis of student learning and school-wide data.

Unlike a consultant, a school coach enters into a long-term agreement with a school. In our case, we work with schools over the course of three to five years, spending as much as 40 half-days on site over the course of a year. This allows us to get to know the school context very well, be responsive to the school's needs, and provide the necessary balance between pressure and support required to sustain improvement. Because coaches sole responsibility to a school is to support school improvement efforts, they have the time and technical expertise required to be thoughtful and responsive to a school. Few school leaders have that luxury. The Southern Maine Partnership school coaching model is based on five core beliefs:

- Schools must establish a bold and clear vision.

- Shared leadership, that shepherds the work, is essential.
- It is necessary to have an action planning cycle that includes reflection informed by data.
- Sufficient and regularly scheduled time for professional development, reflection, and planning must be in place.
- All members of the greater school community should be included in school improvement efforts, including students, parents, community, staff, district personnel, and school board members.

Meaningful, transformational change challenges the deepest beliefs about teaching and learning in a school community, which is often an emotionally charged situation, a tricky one for administrators to lead, as it challenges teachers' competence. An outsider is sometimes in a better position to facilitate that process. While a consultant can often play the role of instigator or catalyst for change, the role of school coach goes a step further by establishing ongoing working relationships with members of the school community to see the change through. Below, we identify three crucial roles that a coach plays in educator and school development:

1. A coach builds trust by building relationships. In order for an outsider to affect the kind of transformational change most high schools need, there must be a high level of trust; as school improvement coaches, we seek to earn that trust by building strong, open and honest relationships with the leaders of the school, official and unofficial. In addition to the administrative personnel, there are other leaders who influence the work of the school, and it is essential to understand who those individuals are, and what their roles are in the school community. Those "unofficial leaders" often do not carry titles, but carry quite a bit of influence in faculty meeting discussions, for example.
2. A coach is responsive to schools' day-to-day concerns (helping put out fires), while always maintaining the big picture view, the school's vision. In order for school coaches to prove their value to the school in big issues, they must first prove their worth in the smaller issues that consume

administrators' and teachers' time. Often it is the willingness (and ability) to get "down and dirty" with the reality of school which is what distinguishes a "coach" who is there for the long haul, from a one-shot consultant or occasionally present university faculty member. As we build relationships and come to understand the school culture and climate, we listen for starting points that will leverage the work of the school and move it forward. We look for the entry points that could lead to a series of actions that will result in effective change for students' learning experiences. We ask ourselves "what will have the biggest, deepest, longest lasting impact on student learning?"

3. A coach includes voices of all stakeholders in the planning and decision-making process. How are decisions made? How do people find out about the decisions that are made? What is the role (really) of students, parents and community members? The process of coming to agreement when including a broad cross-section of stakeholders is much more time and energy intensive; however, when consensus is reached, the process of implementation is much faster and often more effective.

As coaches, we are involved in a wide range of activities. For example, we assist schools in developing a comprehensive action plan, based on their vision; this includes five-year goals, short-term strategies, and concrete action steps with measurable outcomes. And we conduct mid-year reflection based on data related to action plan goals. We serve as facilitators of meetings and workshops, co-planners of professional learning and planning time and other events, data collectors, resource brokers, student and teacher shadows, participants in community forums and school board meetings. We make connections within and outside of school, spread the good stories about our schools within the school and with other schools with whom we are also working. We endeavor to form collaborative relationships among the schools engaged in coaching. In addition, we build leadership capacity by coaching existing school leaders to enhance their effectiveness, periodically providing feedback, asking probing questions, communicating our personal observations of the school's progress toward stated

goals, and offering suggestions for ways to leverage the work.

High schools are facing an unprecedented level of scrutiny. Whether it's making Adequate Yearly Progress, demonstrating that its teachers are highly qualified, decreasing its dropout rate while increasing the number of graduates entering college, the stakes are indeed very high. Just as every student needs customized support to be successful, we believe that every high school needs similar support to meet its school improvement imperative. School coaching with an emphasis on supporting teacher professional growth is one way to support the achievement of our nation's school improvement needs.

References

Evans, R. (2000). *The human side of school change: Reform, resistance, and the real-life problems of innovation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Growing Leaders: An Approach to Educator Development

Lynne Miller and Cindy O'Shea

Maine, like many other states, has been experiencing a leadership crisis. Eight years ago, ten Southern Maine Partnership superintendents decided to do something about it. In the spirit of collaboration that the Partnership promotes, the ten district leaders co-constructed with university faculty a new approach to leadership development: the Leadership for Tomorrow's Schools program (LTS). The idea for a new kind of leadership development had been germinating for some time among a subset of Southern Maine Partnership superintendents who had formed smaller regional alliances so they could collaborate more intensely on issues of curriculum, teaching, and assessment.

The notion of "growing our own leaders" was born of necessity. Maine is a resource-poor state; its districts are small and cannot afford the array of central office administrators that exist in other locales. But, Maine is rich in exceptional

classroom teachers. And it is that resource that superintendents decided to harvest. Planning took place on an island in Casco Bay, where a group of public school educators, university faculty, and business leaders spent two rain-soaked days together. The agenda was clear: to agree on the kind of leadership that districts would require for the future and to develop design principles to guide the preparation of leaders for that future. Participants reviewed documents that described the conditions of schooling as they exist in the present and how they might appear in the desired future. The galvanizing idea was that each district would identify emerging leaders and invite them to participate in a program that would prepare them for new roles in their schools and district. There was agreement that the program should combine academic courses and real-life work in a seamless fabric of experiences.

The key elements in the program design were identified as:

- Building a program on the basis of desired futures for schools rather than a skill set.
- Developing a common language for and about teaching, learning, and assessment.
- Holding districts responsible for identifying and nurturing leaders, and making leadership development integral to their work.
- Engaging school districts and the university in a partnership where both entities are willing to forgo “business as usual” and create new ways to advance school leadership.
- Developing a professional community through a cohort group that stays together for two years.
- Having participants involved in the real work of the districts as well as university courses.

A cohort of 30 teachers completed LTS in the spring of 2001. They completed fifteen hours of graduate credit. Practical work in the districts was part of all course requirements; demonstrations of application to local issues and problems comprised a major portion of course assessments; and final exhibitions took the form of presentations to district leadership teams. Graduate credits that were earned as part of LTS can now be applied toward advanced degrees at the university – in programs that have been

especially designed to accommodate this unique experience.

LTS is now preparing for its fourth cohort, this one aimed at growing leaders in the middle and high schools of the region. Over time, the program has been refined to meet changing needs and to reflect new understandings. For instance, in the third cohort (2002-2004) there was a change in the sequence of courses. The original sequence began with the study of leadership and organizational behavior and followed with a focus on teaching, learning, and assessment. District work was initiated at the beginning of the two-year cycle and continued for the entire length of the cohort experience. Third cohort revisions reversed the order of courses, leading off with an emphasis on teaching, learning, and assessment—

areas more familiar to and resonant with the experience of classroom teachers. LTS participants not only studied theory and practice of teaching, learning, and assessment, but engaged with their district teammates in a cycle of three classroom observations. They formed partner groups and assumed the role of observer and observed. Each cycle consisted of goal-setting, observation, debriefing, written feedback and observations. The culminating activity for each group was to formulate a plan of action concerning teaching, learning, and assessment and to schedule a presentation for the following year to the school.

At the end of the first years, district teams formulated a plan of action concerning teaching, learning and assessment and presented it to the district leadership teams. Then, the teams were able to co-construct their district work for the next year. This new sequence proved to be very effective, connecting participants to the learning agenda of the school and providing opportunity to rehearse their ideas before they were asked to implement them. District work in the second year reflected the quality of preparation and planning that took place in the previous year.

Now, as LTS enters its fourth cycle, it is poised to engage its next cohort group in a program that is more sophisticated in both theory and practice. It is informed by the idea of “legitimate peripheral

participation... the process by which newcomers become included in a community of practice” and learn how to become full participants in and practitioners of new roles. (Wenger, 1998, p.100) Key to the idea of legitimate peripheral practice are six practices: (1) having legitimate access to a community of school leaders, (2) engaging in the practice of leadership, first in peripheral ways and ultimately as full participants, (3) “performing “ the practice of leadership, (4) fostering identity as leaders and the motivation to lead, and (5) helping district leadership to change (Lieberman & Miler, 2004).

Leadership for Tomorrow’s Schools is a living example of a new kind of educator development where school districts and the university respond to the crisis in leadership by joining together to grow their own.

References

- Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1999). *Teachers: Transforming their world and their work*. New York: Teaches College press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

*The Society of Professors of Education
c/o Dr. Robert C. Morris
Department of Educational Leadership & Professional Studies
State University of West Georgia
1600 Maple Street
Carrollton, GA 30118*



