

Engaging Post-Baccalaureate Certification Candidates in the PDS Experience

Susan D. Myers, Assistant Professor
Texas Tech University
College of Education
Box 41079
Lubbock, TX 49409
(806) 742-1997 x 249
susan.myers@ttu.edu

Margaret A. Price, Assistant Professor
Texas Tech University
College of Education
Box 41709
Lubbock, TX 79409
(806) 742-1997 x 318
Peggie.price@ttu.edu

Engaging Post-Baccalaureate Certification Candidates in the PDS Experience

Annotation: Two teacher educators share their experiences incorporating post-baccalaureate teacher candidates into a professional development school model. The challenges experienced by stakeholders in the partnership resulted in the re-visioning of the collaborative model.

Abstract: The teacher shortage crisis has led to different iterations of certification programs. Whether post-baccalaureate, alternative certification or fast-track undergraduate configurations, the goal of schools and colleges of education is to get as many highly qualified teachers into the classroom as quickly as possible.

In this article two teacher educators share their positive and negative experiences encountered in the re-visioning of a secondary professional development school (PDS). Once a traditional, three semester undergraduate program, the PDS was in danger of being abandoned due to low enrollment and university budget reductions. In order to keep the model from extinction, the stakeholders adapted the program to fit the needs of the post-baccalaureate certification participants.

Engaging Post-Baccalaureate Certification Candidates in the PDS Experience

Introduction:

Preparation, recruitment and retention of novice teachers in Texas schools have reached critical proportions ([Ingersoll, 1999](#); [SBEC, 2003](#)). College and university teacher preparation programs along with district, state and private alternative certification programs are producing as many certified teachers as time, space and location will allow. Yet, a growing need for qualified competent teachers remains.

This crisis in teacher shortage has led to many iterations of certification programs. Whether post-baccalaureate, alternative certification or fast-track undergraduate configurations, the goal is to get as many qualified teachers into the classroom as quickly as possible. In Texas there is critical need for teachers in secondary science, math, special education and bilingual/ESL ([SBEC, 2004](#)). This need has led to attempts at legislation and subsequent rulings by the state board of education for the reduction of secondary teacher certification qualifications ([TEA, 1995](#)). Any person who has a degree in any subject area can complete a credentialing test in professional pedagogy and responsibility and one or more content areas and receive temporary certification ([SBEC, 2004](#)). The message is clear to colleges and schools of education: both your services and your programs are expendable. You must provide quality programs to those who could get teaching positions through other means.

Program Description

Since its inception, the secondary post-baccalaureate program at the southwestern university used in this study has been a major provider of teachers in Texas. Though the statewide teacher shortage crisis expanded exponentially ([Ingersoll, 2001](#)) the university's college of education was on the cusp of providing this alternate route to certification in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Whether the program configuration is considered "fast-track" or a glorified alternative certification program ([Price, Schultz & Verdi, 2000](#)), it unquestionably has attracted a large clientele. Faculty and staff involved in this program have grappled with the dichotomy presented by such a concentrated program. Indeed, the question remains whether or not the abbreviated format can prepare quality teachers for the classrooms they will enter.

Currently, at this university, it is possible for a degreed student to complete post-baccalaureate course work in one semester or two summer sessions. Ideally, the preservice teacher remains in the program for a one-semester long student teaching experience. More often than not, post-baccalaureate students actively seek an internship experience rather than a traditional semester of supervised student teaching experience. The trade-off is somewhat logical in post-baccalaureate students' eyes: rather than spending thousands of dollars for a student teaching experience, they can get on the job training and earn a salary. Many post-baccalaureate students also assume teaching is an easy task and that certification classes are a waste of their time and money. Thus, although the student teaching semester provides an opportunity to gain experience before entering the workforce, many post-baccalaureate students bypass the traditional supervision experience for a paid internship.

Literature Review

Background

For the purpose of this article, the term internship is defined as a one year on-the-job teaching experience in lieu of a supervised student teaching experience. While interns are monitored by monthly visits from university supervisors, they have no in-class cooperating teacher assistance. Student teachers have at least the benefit of one semester of supervised teaching experience, where they transition into daily classroom practice. Interns, however, may undertake their first teaching position with little or no actual teaching experiences. Once hired, they are usually appointed an on-site mentor (veteran teacher) who ideally assists with day-to-day professional responsibilities. Current literature exposes the caveats of these types of appointed mentors ([Danin & Bacon, 1999](#); [Feiman-Nemser, 1990](#); [Feiman-Nemser, Schwille, Carver, & Yusko, 1999](#)).

Literature on mentoring practices provides many accounts of the challenges of providing adequate support to those new in the profession ([Odell & Huling, 2000](#)). Mandated induction programs often result in mentors being assigned by school administrators. Mentor training may be very limited and expectations of the mentorship role vary widely ([Danin & Bacon, 1999](#); [Feiman-Nemser, Schwille, Carver, & Yusko, 1999](#)). While mentoring has been shown to be a valuable support for new professionals, the reality is that it does not always provide the necessary incentives or mechanisms for the intensive support necessary for an internship position ([Tickle, 2000](#)).

Partnerships, Preparation and PDS

Colleges and schools of education, regardless of the program, are charged with the responsibility of providing knowledge base and field experiences for their preservice

teachers to prepare them for the classrooms they will be entering. One of the most successful initiatives for preparing classroom-ready, sustainable professionals is the professional development school (PDS). The PDS is a collaborative school/university partnership in which school administrators, teachers and university professors share the responsibility for the preparation of teachers. Primarily situated in undergraduate programs, the PDS is viewed as a long-term, field operated professional experience in which preservice teachers are immersed in the world of teaching. The PDS experience usually provides concurrent university course work and observation experiences at a school site over multiple semesters.

Since publication of *Tomorrow's Schools* ([Holmes Group](#), 1990) the educational community has kept a watchful and critical eye on how the premises of professional development schools are implemented to the greatest end: producing quality novice teachers. Recent literature on the role of Professional Development Schools in educational reform efforts ([Howey](#), 1999; [Ross, Brownell & Sindelar](#), 1999; [Shelley & Washburn](#), 2000; and many others) resonate with varying perspectives on the challenges and promises of university/school partnerships. Schools and colleges of education have formulated varying models of what professional development schools should look like and how they should operate (Abdal-Haqq, 1998).

Certainly the introduction ([1998](#)) and revision ([2001](#)) of standards by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education indicates there is some consensus (among those institutions that deign [NCATE](#) approval) as to the goals and guidelines of the PDS. Standards create frameworks from which many different models might emerge.

The individual needs of the stakeholders in each PDS collaborative guide the construction of the ultimate framework ([Abdal-Haqq](#), 1996).

Origins of one PDS

The professional development school model has taken many different forms in the partnership activities between the local school district and this university's College of Education. The late 1980s to the early 1990s was an exciting period of collaborative activity between these two entities. Secondary PDS classes were established at one high school and one junior high school. However, the excitement waned when external funding ran out and the founding collaborative team broke up. The original agreement remained intact (on paper), but the cooperative work had ceased.

The secondary PDS concept resurfaced early in 1999. An agreement was forged by professors in the College of Education and the newly appointed principal of the local high school. Together, the team investigated the possibilities for success, as well as the challenges of reviving the PDS initiative. They re-established a firm collaborative commitment, in spite of their lack of external funding.

The partnership was cemented in the spring of 2000. Further plans were made to map out the groundwork and curriculum. A team of four clinical faculty was selected to work with the university professor in developing coursework for pedagogy classes that bridged the theory-to-practice continuum. As a teaching team, they shared teaching and supervisory responsibilities for cohort members, as the cohort members experienced the gradual transition from college student to pre-professional teachers. They visualized a plan to recruit a cohort of undergraduate preservice teachers who would do all field work, pedagogy classes and student teaching at the PDS for three consecutive semesters. They

made further plans for extra-curricular activities for the college students, staff-development activities for the teaching team, and action research projects with the high school students.

From Spring 2001 until Spring 2002, two cohorts of undergraduate secondary preservice teachers completed the PDS program. Though each semester offered new challenges, 18 members of the cohort completed the PDS program and all successfully completed credentialing exams on their first attempt. Seventeen of the cohort members are now employed in Texas public schools and have received exemplary professional evaluations during their probationary periods.

The teaching team found continuous challenges confronted them each semester. The clinical faculty endured long informational sessions addressing the constantly changing standards imposed upon teacher education programs by national, state and COE entities. They also learned the fragility of university support when administrative changes occurred and money became an issue. The university professor was suitably informed when faculty concerns about state standardized testing, teacher accountability and other outside constraints breached the theoretical approaches they had negotiated in their professional development meetings. Also of considerable concern was the dynamic nature of the public schools and the change initiated by each passing semester: scheduling of classes, mobility of teachers and administrators, and elusive funding for special programs.

The challenges they encountered during the first two years of their partnership were very similar to those recounted from numerous other programs. ([Sandholts & Dadles, 2000](#)). They experienced first-hand the meaning of partnership, where change is

constant and on-going. An inevitable result is different iterations of the idea of collaboration.

Changes in the Program

Though they experienced many alterations in the program they first envisioned, the process of team building and negotiation continued. Of particular concern for the clinical faculty were the issues of scheduling university classes within the framework of their regular school day, compensation from the university and incentives from the school district, and their efficacy in interacting with university faculty and students. For university faculty, the issues centered more around the time and attention necessary for collaborative efforts, and the merit such activities are awarded by promotion and tenure committees.

They found a recent significant drop in their undergraduate enrollment of secondary students who wished to participate in the PDS to be a considerable challenge. It soon became evident that if the program were to continue, there would need to be dramatic changes in how they recruited participants.

A new university faculty member expressed interest in becoming involved in secondary PDS efforts. In Summer 2003, Ann and Diane discussed the possibilities of combining their different areas of expertise and creating an opportunity for post-baccalaureate students to participate in the PDS experience. After examining enrollment for the fall semester, they determined there were enough students in the post-baccalaureate secondary program to form a cohort in two of their required classes. Typically, these students experienced limited field opportunities. The appointment of their newest faculty member thus provided a means to develop the PDS vision.

They feared if the program was not offered for even a minimum of one semester at the established PDS site, there would be difficulty regaining the partnership that had been forged. However, as this was a significant variation from the original plan, the details of the changes needed to be negotiated with school administrators and clinical faculty. When presented with the proposal for course configuration and its potential impact on PDS stakeholders, it was unanimously agreed that the program could not be abolished; it was far too valuable to drop.

Moreover, the changes made to serve post-baccalaureate students within the PDS context impacted the program in several areas. More specifically, university students were affected immediately; the structure of clinical faculty participation was altered, university faculty members were added and changed; and the roles and responsibilities of school administrators were reconsidered.

Immediate plans were made to adjust to the introduction of post baccalaureate students in the PDS configuration. During collaborative planning sessions, clinical faculty, school administrators, and university professors negotiated plans to implement the change. The impact would be felt in several capacities. What follows is a description of how the impact was felt at each level of the partnership.

Impact on Post-Baccalaureate Preservice Teachers

Preservice teachers with no formal observation of “real kids and real teachers” have little to draw from when asked what the job of teaching entails ([Anderson & Holt-Reynolds, 1995](#); [Feiman-Nemser, 1990](#); [Feiman-Nemser & Featherston, 1992](#)). The single greatest impact the post baccalaureate students related was how their view of teaching had changed over the course of the semester. Written responses and reflections

about their observations and class discussions revealed that students recognized they were getting a more intensive perspective of day-to-day classroom practice. The opportunity to be paired with a teacher from their content area for extended periods of time provided them with opportunities to begin professional conversations about their specific teaching field.

The students commented on their new awareness of classroom practice, such as planning, management, and accommodating diverse learners:

I really saw how much planning it takes to be a teacher. I was amazed.

I see areas I need to really work on -like organization and classroom management...

I didn't know how much planning was involved day-to day.

The opportunity to connect with one or more teachers gave some students increased confidence in their knowledge and abilities. For others, it provided an increased awareness and self-understanding, allowing them to focus on specific areas of growth as they prepared to student teach.

Participating in classrooms in their teaching field also allowed some students to make professional connections they could use for future support. The students noted:

The organization of this class was very beneficial to me. My teacher did an excellent job of allowing me to take any role I desired in her class. She never made me feel unwelcome and was always giving me advice.

I think that there is no better way to learn about a profession than by

being there to live it. I don't want to be sheltered from the ugly side of teaching and was happy to see that it's not just a bowl full of cherries. It was good experience to have to show up in a professional manner. I count myself fortunate for the chance to participate in such a unique experience.

The observations were awesome! I would have liked to visit a few different classes to provide exposure to more methodologies where I could "borrow" ideas.

Outside the realm of classroom observation, PDS students were also able to see university faculty in a different light. Traditionally, teacher preparation courses are conducted on the university campus, where activities and discussions are taught without classroom context. When and if field experiences are included, they may be limited in scope and duration and faculty are often unable or unwilling to be active participants. The PDS, however, provides opportunities to work with faculty whose job responsibilities include such mentoring and guidance.

The students in these two courses were able to observe some of the subtleties and intricacies of professional relationships. As university faculty collaborated in planning courses, greater care was taken to align course objectives, assignments, and topics. A cohort arrangement allowed for class discussions that referred to topics and issues discussed in both classes. Often, course content is perceived as repetitious and/or unconnected and students value it less. However, students in the cohort indicated a sense of a parallelism and interconnectedness. Specific topics, such as lesson planning, classroom management, and the teacher appraisal system were presented within the

context of the classroom and through team-teaching with clinical faculty. This collaboration provided students with greater insight into all areas of planning.

Through the PDS arrangement I was able to gain insights into the profession of teaching that no textbook or college professor could have told me.

The observations were most helpful to me. Being in a classroom setting and watching the teachers and students interact together was the greatest benefit.

The presentations from the Lubbock High staff were very informing.

They provided ideas on how to handle situations such as discipline, management, and school expectations. They provided a real-world idea of what goes on in the classroom and what to expect as a new teacher.

The PDS clinical faculty presentations were very helpful. A new teacher is unaware of committees, plans, and organizations that one needs to be involved in...I also liked how the teachers who presented were down-to-earth and spoke to us like colleagues.

The PDS students' exposure to collegial professional collaboration clearly provided them opportunities to develop their own informed praxis. The PDS students were able to witness first-hand the value of flexibility and compromise between schools and universities. While sentiments such as, "Why don't instructors coordinate and cooperate more?" are often expressed, these students personally observed the complexities of collegiality and communication within the context of actual classrooms.

Impact on Clinical Faculty and School Administrators

Change for school faculty is, simply put, a way of life. Visit any campus on a given day and you can appreciate the flexibility needed to navigate a typical school day. However, participating in a PDS requires additional flexibility, patience, and stamina. In the public school arena, particular challenges include: scheduling conference times for teachers; scheduling a three hour college class within the framework of a school day; and, defining roles for all stakeholders. In such a setting, change seemingly is the only constant.

The changes clinical faculty experienced in this partnership were markedly different from when the program started. At the beginning of the PDS, clinical faculty were considered “instructors of record”, meaning they had shared responsibility for assessment and curriculum content of the courses. As the configuration changed and the preservice teacher audience was altered, clinical faculty roles changed markedly. In the post baccalaureate PDS, the clinical faculty were guest lecturers and team teachers at various times during the semester, where previously they had taught one structured class each week.

One clinical faculty in particular had difficulty relinquishing the control aspect from the previous PDS arrangement. Overriding the university professor, the clinical faculty disciplined a college student for tardiness, just as she would have disciplined one of her high school students. It was hard for her to give up ownership of students’ time and her concept of professional behavior of students.

School administrators, who were once only involved in the PDS in a support capacity, became direct participants. The assistant principal for instruction placed students into their assigned observation classrooms; classroom placements in the original

PDS had been made in four major content areas by the clinical faculty. As specialists in their respective fields, the clinical faculty placed the college students in their specific subject area classrooms. Administrators were recruited to help with field placements for the increased number of preservice teachers, whose teaching fields ran the gamut of the curriculum.

Scheduling around teachers' conference periods and arranging for the preservice teachers to have optimum opportunities to observe best practice in classrooms was daunting, at best. Not only did the administrator spend large amounts of time in scheduling, she also assumed the responsibility for contacting school faculty about placements. Additionally, she had to locate an available classroom that would accommodate college personnel and a university course schedule that conflicted with the regular school schedule. Such a juggling act indeed proved challenging.

When the program first began, administrators arranged for the clinical faculty to have a common planning/conference period. This time was used to facilitate planning and discussion of the PDS, as well as for allowing a common time for clinical faculty to meet with the university students. This, too, changed as teachers' schedules were altered to meet additional duty assignments and when school needs necessitated a change in course offerings. As a result of the common meeting time being eliminated, teachers were required to add PDS as extra responsibility rather than as a professional incentive.

Impact on University Faculty

Although many reports on PDS recount the impact on students in the school partnership and the impact on pre-service teachers, there is also an impact on the faculty who participate. This experience was no different; the students and faculty both had to

navigate changes within their professional and their personal relationships during this semester. The following accounts describe their perceptions and experiences as they embarked on a new iteration of the PDS at this high school.

Perspectives from Faculty 1

As a teacher educator trained in collaborative strategies, I have found the work of PDS a very lonely job. In a university that is striving for recognition as a Tier 1 research institution, work in the field is given very little credibility. Often attached to the “service” component of the holy trinity of the promotion and tenure pathway, many junior faculty opt out of the hard work it takes to establish partnerships with schools. For the first five years of my career as a teacher educator, I worked continuously to establish relationships with multiple secondary schools in close proximity to the university. It is time consuming work and it is costly in terms of establishing a strong scholarship component of the dossier. Many of my colleagues, while quite interested in getting into the schools for their personal research agenda, soon lost interest in doing what it takes to establish a firm, solid working relationship with “school people.”

For three years a great deal of my time and effort was spent getting the secondary PDS established. The first year was intensive ground work: getting to know the administrators in the buildings, establishing relationships with teachers, attending numerous meetings and planning sessions. After the team of clinical faculty was selected, there were even longer days and nights spent establishing roles within the “teaching team,” articulating the goals of our shared responsibilities, and negotiating curriculum needs for the preservice teachers. The second year was spent operating the first cohort of secondary PDS participants and learning very important lessons about what works

with students, and what does not; how to work through changes in faculty, clientele and administrators; and, a change in vision at the district and university levels regarding priorities of funding special programs such as PDS. The third year, a drop in enrollment at the undergraduate level and funding issues signaled a “death” knell for the PDS as it had originally been perceived. Subsequently, its very establishment soon appeared to be in jeopardy.

When Diane joined our secondary faculty it became apparent she was a natural for working with PDS. She, like me, had been a public school teacher for almost two decades before coming to the realm of higher education. She also valued the experiences our students could obtain from being in a strong field based program. It became clear that our high school PDS was in jeopardy of being dropped completely, when Diane approached me with the idea of maintaining the partnership with the high school in a somewhat different format.

We had previously discussed the post-baccalaureate program and its lack of field experience. Although this was a troubling aspect for many of the secondary faculty members, we could not find a solid solution. We had also entertained the notion of some type of team-teaching within the post-baccalaureate program to reinforce theoretical precepts of best practice that transcended our previously stand-alone courses. Diane approached me with the idea that we might create a cohort format for at least two classes we were scheduled to teach and locate the courses within the context of the PDS. It would provide a vehicle for two important aspects: maintaining our relationship with the school, administration, faculty and staff of the high school, and providing a valuable field

experience component for our post-baccalaureate students. It was a brilliant idea that I agreed with completely.

Perspectives from Faculty 2

I entered the PDS after it had been in operation for several years. As a new faculty member to the university, I was excited about the opportunity to become involved with an established partnership. Including our post-baccalaureate students in a more intensive field-based situation seemed to be a way to enhance their program.

Becoming a participant “after the fact” of the initiation and development of this partnership provided its own considerations. Knowing how fragile school/university collaboration can be, my primary goal was to transition as smoothly as possible into the existing program. While elements such as trust and communication had been well established in this partnership, it was critical not to undo years of previous work in these areas. In order to accomplish this, I perceived my role as one primarily of “listener.” It did not take long to become accepted into the PDS, due to the skillful assistance of my colleague. Ann guided me into the process and integrated me into the setting by including me in clinical faculty planning sessions, meetings with campus administrators, and aligning our courses.

In respect to course content, I actually made few adjustments to my existing course. The biggest consideration was that of allowing for a shortened class session each week. We allowed for student observation time within the context of our three-hour classes. Some topics I had previously taught were adjusted and altered, as they would now be covered in the other course and/or taught by clinical faculty. I felt these changes, however, strengthened the course, as we were able to complement these topics and

expand the information and discussions. I also felt students had an increasing perception of their role in schools through their participation in the PDS. Other professors remarked about the bond this cohort had cultivated within their courses. It seemed their shared experiences created a greater sense of community, as opposed to the more fragmented perception they typically held of their education courses.

One of my biggest impressions from this first year of our experience was the intensity of participating in this type of collaboration. While I eagerly anticipated the chance to work closely with school faculty and my colleague, it quickly became apparent that this kind of work extends well beyond the university classroom walls. I had heard the comments about field-based endeavors not being adequately rewarded or even understood by universities, but the reality was now sinking in. I watched as my partner navigated the university system to get payment for the clinical faculty and engaged in lengthy discussions about student placement and teacher schedules. Simply locating a room for our students to meet on the high school campus was sometimes a monumental task.

Discussion & Implications for Future Practice

Participating in a PDS is still not without its complexities and challenges. Changes in configurations of partnership endeavors appear to be inevitable, therefore, faculty must consider how they fluidly accommodate and adapt. The authors found maintaining a PDS partnership, particularly in a secondary setting, involves intensive communication, constant flexibility, a commitment to collaboration, and mutually supportive endeavors.

Communication

Communication is critical to any partnership. Within the PDS this fact takes on a greater significance. Open channels of communication among clinical faculty, university partners, school administrators, and preservice teachers are vital for continued success. Each semester presents new challenges. Additions to the partnership team, whether university students, new clinical faculty, and/or additional university faculty, requires education about the goals, objectives, and history of the PDS. It also involves entertaining new perspectives and the expertise of each new member. Collaboratively, faculty re-vision the PDS's mission and goals within the context of current perspectives.

Through continuous dialogue with clinical faculty and administrators, they strive to reach a balance of open and ongoing communication. Being present on campus allows opportunities to trouble-shoot effectively and in a timely manner. Faculty presence in the hallways and the classrooms made their participation transparent. The students, teachers, and administrators treat them as regular members of the school culture.

Administrators are more of a presence in the PDS, regularly visiting classes and sharing with students their perspectives and expectations about each person's role. Administrators also attend professional development sessions and offer their expectations and perceptions of how the operation and procedures could be more efficient.

Preservice students participating in the program are given multiple opportunities to voice their perceptions during the semester in the two course configuration. Open dialogue with university professors and clinical faculty allows for constant reassessment and alignment of course delivery. The authors gained greater insight about extending their students' knowledge and understanding about teaching through examining the students' perceptions of the PDS.

Flexibility

The need for flexibility is undeniably one of the greatest factors in successful collaboration. The clinical faculty and university professors continuously evaluate how to modify course content and delivery. The teaching team collectively arranges the curricular schedule and topic assignments. When possible, opportunities for team teaching between university and clinical faculty are utilized.

The teachers' variable schedules required flexibility from university faculty to accommodate the teachers coming to the professors' classrooms. With no common conference periods during scheduled university classes, it was necessary for the professors to become virtual substitute teachers. Numerous changes and adaptations to the program cemented their commitments, both individually and collectively, to the PDS. The authors concur that the benefits far outweigh the roadblocks that are naturally present.

Despite the many changes and adaptations to the program, there is still a continued commitment to the benefits perceived by collaborating to prepare future teachers.

Mutual Support

Being part of a team comes with both rights and expectations. Since PDS work is not considered obligatory as professional assignments by school districts and/or by universities, recognition for its success must come in other facets. The extra work that is done in the name of PDS is often invisible to the general public. Therefore, educators must act as professional advocates for each other in their roles within the partnership. They must include each other in professional advancement through conference

presentations, letters of recognition and support, and showcasing the program in various milieus.

Commitment to Collaboration

Communication, flexibility, and mutual support is achieved through a commitment to collaboration. In the three years the PDS has operated, obstacles have never become barriers. The desire to continue through adversity and change has strengthened the commitment. Forecasting ever greater changes in the future, the solidarity of the primary stakeholders is going to be of utmost importance. Staying true to the vision of the Professional Development School, the participants will maintain their course for preparing high quality teachers for tomorrow's classrooms.

Conclusion

As a means of addressing the teacher shortage, alternate strategies must be employed in the preparation of highly qualified teachers. Post baccalaureate programs have provided many students with an opportunity to achieve teacher certification in expedient fashion. Though abbreviated, such initiatives do not have to abandon program quality. The authors feel it is their responsibility to provide optimum experiences to link theory to practice through the configuration of the PDS partnership.

Modeling collaboration between clinical faculty and university faculty is one way of assisting post baccalaureate students in their transition from apprentice to teacher. Making interactions between all stakeholders transparent for preservice teachers reduces the perception that communication is limited and disjointed between these entities. Frequent observations of collaboration also serve to increase the possibility that, as new

teachers, they will perceive the benefits of collegiality and reduce the isolation so often reported in induction research.

Allowing post baccalaureate students time for structured classroom interactions with teachers and students also increases their awareness of and preparedness for their roles as teachers. Engaging these teacher candidates into early classroom practice increases the probability they will have the capacity to meet the needs of their own students. Professional development school partnerships allow for high-quality preparation of reflective teachers, equipped to transition into the profession of teaching.

References

- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1996, Summer). An information provider's perspective on the professional development school movement. *Contemporary Education*, 237-40.
- Abdal-Haqq, I. (1998). *Professional development schools: Weighing the evidence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Anderson, L. & Holt-Reynolds, D. (1995, October). *Prospective teachers' beliefs and teacher education pedagogy: Research based on teacher educator's practical theory*. Research report 95-6. East Lansing, Michigan: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Danin, R. & Bacon, M. A. (1999). What teachers like (and don't like) about mandated induction programs. In M. Scherer (Ed.), *A better beginning: Supporting and mentoring new teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (1990). Teacher preparation: Structural and conceptual alternatives. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (pp. 212-233). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. & Featherstone, H. (Eds.), (1992). *Exploring Teaching: Reinventing An Introductory Course*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., Schwille, S., Carver, C., & Yusko, B. (1999). *A conceptual review of literature on new teacher induction*. National Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching. College Park, MD: University of Maryland.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional*

- development schools*. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.
- Howey, K. (1999). Professional development schools: Looking ahead. *Peabody Journal Of Education*, 74 (3-4), 322-34.
- Ingersoll, R. (1999). The problem of underqualified teachers in American secondary schools. *Educational Researcher* 28, No. 2 26-37.
- Ingersoll, R. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1998). *Designing standards that work for professional development schools*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2001). *Standards for professional development schools*. Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Odell, S. J. and Huling, L. (2000). *Quality mentoring for novice teachers*. Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Price, M. A., Schultz, R. A. & Verdi, M. P. (October 2001). Fast track to teaching: An exploration of a summer post-baccalaureate teacher education experience. *Teacher Education and Practice*, (14)2, 82-103.
- Ross, D.D., Brownell, M.T. & Sindelar, P.T. (1999). Research from professional development schools: Can we live up to the potential? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 74 (3-4), 209-23.
- Sandholts, J.H. & Dadles, S. H. (2000). Professional development school trade-offs in teacher preparation and renewal. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 27 (1), 7-27.

Shelley, A.C. & Washburn, S. (2000). Our NCATE report card: A partnership for excellence. *The Educational Forum*, 64 (2), 156-164.

Texas State Board for Educator Certification (2004). *Temporary Teacher Certificate*.

<http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/certinfo/tempcert/tempcert.asp>.

Retrieved May 16, 2004.

Texas State Board for Educator Certification (2004). *Becoming a teacher in Texas*.

<http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/certinfo/becometeacher.asp>. Retrieved

May 4, 2004.

Texas State Board for Educator Certification (2003). *Estimates of the teacher shortage in Texas public schools for the 2001-2002 academic yeas*.

http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/reprtdatarsrch/tchrshort/Estimates%20of%20the%20Shortage%20of%20Teachers%20in%20Texas%20_2001%20and%202.pdf Retrieved November 9, 2004.

Texas Education Agency (1995). *Texas teacher retention, mobility, and attrition*. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency Policy Analysis and Evaluation Division.

Tickle, L. (2000). *Teacher induction: The way ahead*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.